DEC 4 1962

THE
EXPOSITORY TIMES.

FOUNDED IN 1889 BY

JAMES HASTINGS, D.D.

EDITED BY

A. W. HASTINGS, M.A.

AND

Rev. E. HASTINGS, M.A.

VOLUME THE FORTY-FIRST.

October 1929 – September 1930.

LIBRARY OF
United Theological Seminary
E965
T582 55,567

EDINBURGH:
T. & T. CLARK, 38 GEORGE STREET.

PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN BY
MORRISON AND GIBB LIMITED,
FOR
T. & T. CLARK, EDINBURGH.

LONDON . . . . SIMPKIN MARSHALL, LTD.
MANCHESTER . . . JOHN HEYWOOD.
EDINBURGH . . . . JOHN MENZIES AND CO.
GLASGOW . . . . JOHN MENZIES AND CO.
NEW YORK . . . . CHARLES SCRIBNER'S SONS.

CONTENTS OF VOL. XLI.

AUTHORS.

PAGE

Rev. E. A. Anthony, M.A.—
  Virginibus Puerisque 268
Rev. F. J. Ashley—
  Virginibus Puerisque 23
Professor B. W. Bacon, D.D.—
  The Blessing of the Peacemakers . . 58
Professor John Baillie, D.Litt.— . .
  The Mind of Christ on Moral Problems of To-day—III. The Treatment of Crime 261
Rev. Frank Ballard, D.D.—
  Sunday-School Teaching and the Revised Version 45
Rev. Alex. Baxter—
  Virginibus Puerisque 267
Rev. A. Beaghan—
  Virginibus Puerisque 462
Rev. Harold Bickley, B.D.—
  Virginibus Puerisque 324
Canon T. Herbert Bindley, D.D.—
  1 Peter $3^{18f.}$ 44
  A Note on the 'Second Coming' . . 92
  A Study in 1 Corinthians 15 . . . 503
Rev. Leslie H. Bunn, B.A.—
  John 4^{34-42} 141
  2 Timothy 2^{23-26} 235
Right Rev. E. A. Burroughs, D.D.—
  The Mind of Christ on Moral Problems of To-day—VI. War 438
Rev. A. T. Cadoux, B.A., D.D.—
  The Parable of the Sheep and the Goats 559
E. J. Cook, B.Litt.—
  Synoptic Indications of the Visits of Jesus to Jerusalem 121
Rev. H. J. Dale—
  Conversion 233
Rev. R. Oswald Davies—
  Virginibus Puerisque 513
Professor Martin Dibelius, D.Th., D.Ph.—
  National Contributions to Biblical Science 535
Rev. R. W. Dickson, M.A., M.Th.—
  Virginibus Puerisque 323
James Feather—
  How Joab took Jerusalem . . . 140
Rev. T. Greener Gardner—
  Virginibus Puerisque 172
Principal A. E. Garvie, D.D.—
  Recent Foreign Theology . . . 523
Professor A. R. Gordon, D.D.—
  National Contributions to Biblical Science 302
Professor A. J. Gossip, D.D.—
  The Words from the Cross—III. 'Woman, behold thy Son' . . . 198
Rev. A. Herbert Gray, D.D.—
  The Mind of Christ on Moral Problems of To-day—V. Marriage . . . 391

PAGE

Rev. Canon Peter Green, M.A.—
  The Mind of Christ on Moral Problems of To-day—II. Gambling . . . 213
Rev. S. Greer, M.A.—
  Virginibus Puerisque . . 76, 130, 363
Professor Hermann Gunkel—
  Elisha—The Successor of Elijah . . 182
Bernard G. Hall—
  Philemon and Slavery 336
J. Rendel Harris, Litt.D., LL.D., D.D.—
  An Emendation to 1 Peter 1^{13} . . 43
  A Western Gloss in John 2^{3} . . . 107
  St. James and Theocritus . . . 235
  Mary or Elisabeth? 266
Professor G. D. Henderson, B.D.—
  Adolf von Harnack 487
Rev. F. R. Montgomery Hitchcock, D.D.—
  The Pastorals and a Second Trial of Paul. 20
Rev. Norman Hook, M.A.—
  Incarnation *versus* Inspiration . . 38
  The Doctrine of Providence . . . 359
Rev. John A. Irvine, B.A.—
  Pagan Evangelism in the First Two Centuries 217
Rev. J. W. Jack, M.A.—
  French Theology 430
  Biblical Archæology 475
Rev. Joseph Johnston, M.A.—
  The Words from the Cross—IV. The Cry of Desolation 281
Rev. Arthur S. Langley, F.R.Hist.S.—
  Manna 477
Right Rev. Donald Langley, D.D.—
  John 1^{41} 43
Rev. H. J. Lewis—
  Theology in Relation to Preaching. . 458
Rev. John Macbeath, M.A.—
  Virginibus Puerisque 75
Professor J. E. McFadyen, D.D.—
  Recent Foreign Theology . 42, 275, 379
  The Language of the Pentateuch in its Relation to Egyptian . . . 54
D. MacGillivray—
  Paul's Sense of Beauty. . . . 566
Principal W. M. Macgregor, D.D.—
  The Words from the Cross—II. The Penitent Thief 151
Professor James Mackinnon, Ph.D., D.D.—
  National Contributions to Biblical Science 446, 507
Professor H. R. Mackintosh, D.Phil, D.D.—
  The Great Church Union in Scotland . 15
  Recent Foreign Theology . . 377, 429
Rev. Donald Matheson, M.A.—
  'Actors': Christ's Word of Scorn . 333

UNITED THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
DEC 4 1962

PAGE
Rev. W. M. Mathieson, B.D.—
  Books that have influenced our Epoch—
    W. Robertson Smith's 'The Religion of the Semites' 85
  W. Robertson Smith 336
  'The Cambridge Ancient History' and the Old Testament . . . 371, 470
Rev. E. Hardee Merchant, B.A.—
  Virginibus Puerisque 24
Geo. B. Michell—
  'Time-Measures of the Pentateuch' . 45
Constance Miles—
  Entre Nous 189, 526
C. Anne E. Moberly—
  An Historical Place in Jerusalem . . 381
Professor James Moffatt, D.D.—
  Recent Foreign Theology 278, 379, 476, 565
Rev. J. Emrys Morgan, B.A., B.D.—
  The Church as the Home of the Spiritual Life 71
Rev. W. D. Morris—
  Ephesians 4^{28} 237
Rev. J. H. Morrison, M.A.—
  Natural Law and Miracles . . . 154
David Muir—
  Three Obscure O.T. Passages . . 44
Rev. Eric Parsons, B.A.—
  Virginibus Puerisque 411
Rev. John Paterson, B.D., Ph.D.—
  Virginibus Puerisque 362
Professor W. P. Paterson, D.D., LL.D.—
  Books that have influenced our Epoch—
    Carlyle's 'Sartor Resartus' . . 32
J. L. Paton, M.A.—
  The Mind of Christ on Moral Problems of To-day—VII. Temperance . . 491
Rev. E. A. Payne, B.A., B.D.—
  Virginibus Puerisque 171
Rev. Philip E. Pegg—
  Virginibus Puerisque 551
Rev. H. L. Picken—
  Virginibus Puerisque 552
Rev. R. Martin Pope, M.A.—
  Faith and Knowledge in Pauline and Johannine Thought 421
Rev. F. V. Pratt, M.A.—
  The Exodus of Jesus (Lk 9^{28-31}) . . 376
Rev. F. J. Rae, M.A.—
  The Mind of Christ on Moral Problems of To-day—IV. Education and Religion . 355
Rev. Canon Charles E. Raven, D.D.—
  God and Mr. Middleton Murry . . 296
Rev. E. Ebrard Rees—
  The Cosmic Christ 335
Rev. James Reid, M.A.—
  The Words from the Cross—I. 'Father, forgive them' 103

PAGE
Rev. A. T. Richardson—
  'Time-Measures of the Pentateuch' . 46
Edith Anne Robertson—
  Religion and the Drama . . . 319
Professor J. A. Robertson, D.D.—
  Books that have influenced our Epoch—
    Glover's 'Jesus of History' . . 124
Rev. Principal H. Wheeler Robinson, M.A., D.D.—
  National Contributions to Biblical Science 246
Hugh J. Schonfield—
  Should 'Things strangled' be omitted from Acts 15^{29}? 128
Rev. William Scott, M.A.—
  W. Robertson Smith 336
Principal W. B. Selbie, D.D.—
  A. S. Peake 5
Rev. Hubert L. Simpson, M.A.—
  The Words from the Cross—V. 'I thirst' 317
Very Rev. J. G. Simpson, D.D.—
  The Words from the Cross—VI. 'It is finished' 343
Rev. R. S. Sleigh, M.A., Ph.D.—
  Recent Foreign Theology . . . 432
Rev. A. Small, B.D.—
  The Peace of Jesus 126
  Virginibus Puerisque 463
Professor J. M. Powis Smith—
  National Contributions to Biblical Science 169
Rev. Norman Snaith, M.A.—
  Judges 5^{8} 140
Rev. Leslie E. Soal—
  Virginibus Puerisque 224
Rev. James S. Stewart, B.D.—
  Virginibus Puerisque 129
Rev. Robert Strong, M.A., B.Litt.—
  Virginibus Puerisque 411
Emeritus Principal J. G. Tasker, D.D.—
  Recent Foreign Theology . . . 562
Professor Vincent Taylor, Ph.D., D.D.—
  Recent Foreign Theology . . . 477
Rev. R. L. A. Tingle, B.Sc.—
  Virginibus Puerisque 223
Mrs. A. Threlfall Vickery—
  Virginibus Puerisque 512
Professor Adam C. Welch, D.D.—
  The Purpose of Deuteronomy, Chapter V. 396
  ,, ,, Chapter VI. 548
Rev. James Williams—
  The Rich Young Ruler and St. Paul . 139
Rev. James P. Wilson, B.D.—
  Matthew 26^{50} 334
Herbert G. Wood—
  The Mind of Christ on Moral Problems of To-day—I. Socialism . . . 186
Rev. Thomas Yates, D.D.—
  The Words from the Cross—VII. . 427

SUBJECTS.

PAGE
Actors 333
Agape 241
Allegiance, Divided 364
Animal Suffering 242
Appreciation and Appropriation 73
Archæology, Biblical 475
Armistice 30
Atonement 150, 242
Authority 244
Barthian School 291
Behaviourism 436
Benevolence 196
Bible, Authority of 97
  ,, Fiction and History in 433
  ,, as History 97
  ,, Ignorance of 340
  ,, Importance in Spiritual Life 433
  ,, Indifference to 340
  ,, Interpretation 433
  ,, as Literature 97
Biblical Science, National Contributions to 169, 246, 302, 446, 507, 535
Books that have influenced our Epoch 32, 85, 124
Boy, Training 95
Britain, Contribution to O.T. Study 246
Brotherly Love 197
Cain, Apology for 180
Caholitcity of Mind 79
Childlikeness 82
Christ, Birth and Infancy in Luke's Gospel 390
  ,, Claims, Urgency of 52
  ,, Conflict with Evil 99
  ,, Cosmic 335
  ,, Death of, Traditional Beliefs about 53
  ,, Imitation of 289
  ,, Personality 98
  ,, Sufferings 53, 101
  ,, Visits to Jerusalem 121
Christian Life 289
Christianity in the Past 338
Christmas 133, 143
Church, Home of Spiritual Life 71
  ,, Importance in Spiritual Life 433
  ,, Teaching in 73
  ,, Union 49
  ,, ,, in Scotland 15
Conversion 233
Corpus of Sacred Writings 97
Crime, Treatment of 261
Cross 555
Death and Immortality 189
Divine Aid 194
  ,, Love, Severity of 77
  ,, Meaning of Word 194
Dogma, Reconstruction of 3
Drama and Religion 319
Education and Religion 355
Elisha 182
Emergence 51, 435
Eucharist 387
Evil, Problem of 242

PAGE
Evolution 148, 338
Experience 51, 419
Faith 328
  ,, Adventurous 478
  ,, and Knowledge 421
Fellowship, Christian 72, 242
  ,, with God 290
Foreign Theology 42, 275, 377, 429, 476, 523, 562
Fourth Gospel, Authorship 2
  ,, ,, Relation to Synoptists 2
Freudianism 436
Fundamentalism 291
Future Life 325, 387, 534
  ,, ,, Christian View of 342
Galatians, Epistle 148
  ,, ,, Positive Teaching of 149
Gambling 213
Germany, Contribution to O.T. Study 302
  ,, ,, to Church History 446, 507
  ,, ,, N.T. Science 535
God, as Judge 53
  ,, Love to Man 146
  ,, Meaning of Word 194
  ,, Quest for 137
  ,, Supreme Adventurer 148, 244
Gospel, Preaching 101
Grace 483
Harnack 487
Harvest 521
Hell, Different Ideas of 385
Hypocrisy 333
Immortality 325, 342, 387, 515
Incarnation *v.* Inspiration 38
Indifference 339
Influence 144, 284
James and Theocritus 235
Jerusalem, Tower of David 381
Jesus, Fallibility of 293
  ,, Master Teacher 150
  ,, Meaning for us 150
  ,, Peace of 126
  ,, Purpose of 52
Joab, Capture of Jerusalem 140
Jonathan 464
Judaizers 149
Kagawa 285
Kindness 238
Kingdom 292
Koinonia 241
Literature, Past and Present-Day 338
Love All-in-All 286
  ,, and Labour 286
  ,, Christian 241
  ,, in the N.T. 145
  ,, Universal 197
Manna 477
Marriage 391
Mary or Elisabeth ? 266
Methodist Evangelism 100
Mind and Body, Relation 342
  ,, of Christ on Moral Problems of To-day 186, 213, 261, 355, 391, 438, 491

PAGE
Miracles 158, 485
  ,, Place for 147
Modernism 291, 435
Morality 292
Murry, Middleton 296
Mysticism 296
Natural Law 155
New Psychology 436
New Realism 51, 52
New Testament in History 193
  ,, ,, Influence 194
New Year, Message 191
Obedience 289
Old Testament, Achievement of 481
  ,, ,, History 470
  ,, ,, Records 371
Pagan Evangelism 217
Parable of Sheep and Goats 559
Past, Influence of 337
  ,, Our Debt to 337
Pastorals and a Second Trial of Paul 20
Paul, Opposition to 149
  ,, and Rich Young Ruler 4, 139
  ,, Second Trial 20
  ,, Sense of Beauty 566
Peace 126
Peacemakers 58
Peake, A. S. 5
Personality 289
Philemon and Slavery 336
Pioneers 174
Prayer, Efficacy 196
  ,, Intercessory 196
Preaching, Present-day 339
Providence, Doctrine of 359
  ,, Ways of 143
'Ransom' Saying 53
Real Presence 387
Reconciliation, Christian 74
Relativity 436
Religion, An Adventure 480
  ,, and Common Sense 25
  ,, Current Conception of 295
  ,, and the Drama 319
  ,, and Education 355
  ,, and the Modern Mind 295
  ,, and Morality in the O.T. 483
  ,, Philosophical Approach to 50
  ,, Real and Unreal 552
Religious Experience 289
Remorse 386
Revised Version, Use in Sunday School 45
Rich Young Ruler 4, 139
Saints 49
Science and Religion 50, 147, 154, 338, 435
Second Coming 92
Semi-Pantheism 435
Sin and Guilt 292
  ,, Suffering 242
Social Service 290
Socialism 186
Soul, Destiny of 341, 387

PAGE
South India Problem . . 436
Space-Time 51
Suffering, Gift of . . 101
Sunday School Teaching and the R.V. 45
Teaching in the Church . 73
Temperance . . . 491
Theism, Old Testament . 482
Theology 291
Theology and Preaching . 458
Total Abstinence . . . 528
Tower of David . . . 380
United States, Contribution to O.T. Scholarship . . 169
Unity 30
Values, Significance of . 341
Virgin Birth . . 389, 415
Virginibus Puerisque 23, 75, 129, 171, 223, 267, 323, 362, 411, 462, 512, 551
Vision, Inward . . . 526
War 438
Words from the Cross 103, 151, 198, 281, 317, 343, 427

BOOKS.

PAGE
Alexander, Indian Ferment . 95
Alington, Doubts and Difficulties 116
Allan, Isaiah, chs. 1–39 . 451
Allison, English Religious Life in the Eighth Century . 260
Andrews, Gandhi's Ideas . 191
,, Haunting Years . 404
Angus, Religious Quests . 111
Annual of the American Schools of Oriental Research, ix. 258
Appeal of Christ to the Indian 259
Archer-Shepherd, Orthodox Religion . . . 110
Atonement in History and in Life 253
Austin, Letters to a Fundamentalist. 502
Bacon, Studies in Matthew . 531
Baillie, Place of Jesus Christ 241, 250
Balmforth, St. Luke . . 546
Barton, Royal Inscriptions of Sumer and Akkad . . 315
Begrich, Die Chronologie der Könige von Israel und Juda 277
Bell, Beyond Agnosticism . 349
,, Documents on Christian Unity 542
Bennett, Resurrection of the Dead 354
Bertholet, Dynamismus . 380
Bevan, Hope of a World to Come 533
Blair, When Praying . . 405
Blunt, St. Mark . . . 114
Booth, Bridge between the Testaments 118
Boreham, Three Half-Moons . 239
Boullaye, Jésus et l'histoire . 477
Bouquet, People's Book of Saints 354
Boutflower, Isaiah 1–39 . 251
Bower, Character through Creative Experience . . 500
Braham, Ourselves and Reality 8
Brook, Divine Justice . 207
Broomhall, Hudson Taylor . 117
Brunner, Theology of Crisis . 291
Bulcock, Religion . . . 10
Bullough, Philosophy of St. Thomas Aquinas . . 255
Bundy, Religion of Jesus . 65
Burns, Democracy . . 207
Bury, Selected Essays . . 354
Calkins, Jeremiah . . 400
,, Holy Spirit . . 499
Cambridge Ancient History 371, 470
Carlyle, Sartor Resartus . 32
Causse, Les Dispersés d' Israël 431
Chandler, Christian Religious Experience . . . 116
Charles, Resurrection of Man 252
Charrue, L'incrédulité des Juifs 431
Chisholm, Dawning Epoch . 406
Christian Ethics . . . 14
Clark, Church Discipline in Scotland 254
Clarke, N.T. Problems . . 163
,, Short History of Christian Church . . 167
Clayton, Plain Tales from Flanders 96
Clements, Philip cometh to Andrew 354
Connolly, Didascalia Apostolorum 163
Contemporary American Philosophy 495
Cook, Romans . . . 544
Coutts, Art of Living . . 168
Creative Preaching . . 499
Creed, St. Luke . . . 540
Daiches, Psalms, I. . . 545
Dalman, Jesus-Jeshua . . 9
D'Arcy, Christian Outlook . 147
,, Atonement in History 242
Deane, How to Understand the Gospels . . . 113
Dearmer, Legend of Hell . 113
Deissmann, N.T. in Light of Modern Research . 162, 193
Dewar, Magic and Grace . 211
Dewey, Characters and Events 115
,, Quest for Certainty . 542
Dogma 3, 8
Dougherty, Nabonidus and Belshazzar 61
Driesch, Man and the Universe 66
,, Ethical Principles . 452
Drift of Civilization . . 499
Duncan, St. Paul's Ephesian Ministry . . 161
,, Accuracy of O.T. . 409
Eddington, Process and Reality 205
Elwin, Christian Dhyāna . 501
England, Kant's Conception of God 115
Episcopacy, Ancient and Modern 543
Essays Catholic and Critical^3 244
Evans, A Reason for the Faith 409
Excavations at Kish . . 406
Fairbrother, Introduction to Literature of O.T. . . 10
Feldmann, Geschichte der Offenbarung des A. T. . 277
Fellowship Principles . . 311
Ferguson, Christian Philosophy 351
Ferrar, From Daniel to St. John 546
Flower, Priest in the Church. 454
Foston, Man and the Image of God 403
Fox, Child's Approach to Religion 70
Gábor, Der Hebräische Urrhythmus 276
Gadd, History and Monuments of Ur . . . 61
Gairdner to his Friends . 383
Gammie, Dr. John White . 65
Gaster, Studies and Texts in Folklore . . 64
,, Tittled Bible . . 112
Gillie, Later Story of Hebrews 456
Gloege, Reich Gottes . . 523
Glover, Influence of Christ . 112
,, Jesus of History . 124
Goguel, Jean-Baptiste . . 432
Gollancz, Personalia . . 210
Goudge, Church and the Bible 433
Gowen, Psalms . . . 498
Gray, Sex Teaching . . 258
Gregory, Mercy and Faithfulness 500
Grierson, Haunting Edinburgh 353
Grubb, Quakerism . . 316
Gunn, Problem of Time . 62
Hall, Christian Reunion . 308
Harnack, Einführung in die Alte Kirchengeschichte . 277
Harris, Pro Fide . . 435, 456
Headlam, Christian Unity . 457
Hebrew Union College Annual 204
Hicks, Fullness of Sacrifice . 541
Hodgson, Christian Philosophy 313
Holmes, Philosophy without Metaphysics . . . 351
Hough, Artist and Critic . 499
Hoyle, Teaching of Karl Barth 541
Hughes, Basic Beliefs . . 165
Humbert, Recherches sur les Sources Egyptiennes . 431
Hutcheon, Frankness in Religion 294
James, Christian Faith . 401
Jones, Reality . . . 212
,, Some Exponents of Mystical Religion . 310
,, Christ of Every Road 312

PAGE
Jordan, Book of Job 313
,, Inner History of Great Schism 547
Jung, Jewish Law of Theft 311
Kagawa, Love the Law of Life 286
Kephala, Church of the Greek People 458
Kingdon, Humane Religion 353
Kittel, Great Men and Movements 110
Klages, Science of Character 63
Koch, Adhuc Virgo 279
Köhler, Theologische Rundschau 42
König, Das Buch Hiob 276
Kraeling, Anthropos 109
Krüger, Ausgewählte Märtyrakten[3] 280
,, Kirchengeschichte 280
Lacey, Herbert Thorndike 11
Lagerlöf, Jerusalem 142
Laird, Idea of Value 60
Laun, Social Christianity in England 254
Legendre, Cradle of Bible 316
Lo, China's Revolution 310
Lodge, Phantom Walls 208
,, Beyond Physics 496
Lord, Unity of Body and Soul 119
,, Acts of the Apostles 544
McConnell, Human Needs 458
McCormick, Be of Good Cheer 313
McCown, Genesis of Social Gospel 11
McFadyen, Problem of Pain[3] 450
Machen, Virgin Birth of Christ 389
Mackenzie, Case for Episcopacy 410
Mackinnon, Luther, iv. 309
Mackinnon, Rome of St. Paul 382
Mackintosh, Christian Apprehension of God 9
Macnaughton, Babylonian Chronology 313
Macnicol, What Jesus means for Men 212
,, India in the Dark Wood 347
Macpherson, Modern Cosmologies 209
Marti, Economic Causes of the Reformation 257
Martin, Foreshewings of Christ 546
Masterman, Christianity of To-morrow 12
Mears, Gospel of St. John 355
Mellor, Liberation 67
Mercer, Études sur les Origines de la Religion de l'Egypte 430
Methodism in the Modern World 100
Meyerson, Identity and Reality 350
Miller, Influence of Gesenius on Hebrew Lexicography 69
Moffatt, Love in the N.T. 145
,, Day before Yesterday 337
Montefiore, IV. Ezra 311
,, Rabbinic Literature 539
Moody, Purpose of Jesus 52
Morgan, Mind at the Cross-ways 206

PAGE
Morison, Who Moved the Stone? 402
Moulton, Grammar of N.T. Greek 113
Murry, God 160
My Hopes and Fears for the Church 401
Nairne, Every Man's Story of the N.T. 453
Newton, New Preaching 339
Niebuhr, Denominationalism 308
Odeberg, Fourth Gospel 203
Oesterley and Robinson, Hebrew Religion 495
Offer, Bishop's Register 259
O'Mahony, Desire of God 313
Osborne, Christian Ideas in Political History 209
Otto, Indiens Gnadenreligion 429
Paisley, Epic of Nazarene 99
Pavry, Zoroastrian Doctrine of a Future Life 311
Perry, Scottish Prayer Book 208
Philip, Thomas Chalmers 66
Phillips, The Outcast Christ 500
Pilcher, Hosea 404
Plessis, Evangelization of Pagan Africa 403
Powys, Pathetic Fallacy 452
Poynter, Inside the Roman Church 406
,, The Reformation 547
Puglisi, Prayer 498
Pyke, Protestant Faith 13
Radhakrishnan, Indian Philosophy 206
Randall, Religion and the Modern World 352
Rattenbury, The Testament of Paul 529
Rawlinson, Church of England 387, 407
Reunion of Christendom 66
Rhyn, Treasures of the Dust 120
Richardson, Bible Chronology 502
Rise of the Christian Church 251
Robertson, Some Minor Characters in the N.T. 68
,, Tigers' Teeth 144
,, Who was Jesus? 150
,, Francis Xavier 308
Ropes, Galatians 149
Rose, Gambling 544
Rosen and Bertram, Juden und Phoenizier 476
Ross, Why Preach Christ? 315
Schechter, Studies in Jewish Liturgy 501
Scheel, Documente zu Luther's Entwickelung 280
Schmidt, Die Christusfrage 432
Schonfield, Lost 'Book of the Nativity of John' 252
Scott, Preaching Week by Week 116
,, N.T. Ethics 450
Selbie, Christian Ethic 114
Sell, Messianic Hope 166
,, Sin 166
,, The Ayyub and Mamluk Sultans 166
Shebbeare, Problems of Providence 257

PAGE
Shepherd, Tucker of Uganda 119
Siebens, L'Origine du Code Deuteronomique 42
Simpson, Nature 163
,, South India Schemes 437
,, St. Augustine's Conversion 501
Six Great Anglicans 69
Smith, Religion of the Semites 85, 336, 384
Speaker's Bible 48
Spencer, Theory of Christ's Ethics 114
Standing, Spirit in Evolution 453
Stange, Die Religionswissenschaft der Gegenwart 525
Stauffer, Grundbegriffe einer Morphologie des N.T. Denkens 380
Stein, Die Allegorische Exegese des Philo 278
Steinmann, Zum Werdegang des Paulus 279
Stewart, Can I teach my Child Religion? 260
Strachan, Authority of Christian Experience 161
Taylor, The Gospels 455
Temple Bells 480
Tennant, Philosophical Theology 348
Thomas, Principles of Theology 309
Thornton, Scientific Background of Christian Creeds 457
Tilsley, Dan Crawford 287
Tollinton, Commentaries and Homilies of Origen 259
Tolson, Renaissance of Jesus 207
Troeltsch, Die Absolutheit des Christentums 279
Unwin and Telford, M. G. Pearse 526
Vaughan, Significance of Personality 408
Vogels, Codicum Novi Testamenti Specimina 257
Vogelsang, Luthers Hebraerbrief-Vorlesung 379
,, Strauss 432
Wales, Psalms, Book III. 315
,, ,, ,, IV. 409
Walker, T. B. Freeman 70
,, Idealism of Christian Ethics 166
Ward, Our Economic Morality 120
Warfield, Christology and Criticism 307
Warner, Wesleyan Movement 454
Watt, Intuition of God 165
Weatherhead, Psychology 13
,, After-World of the Poets 115
Webb, Pascal's Philosophy of Religion 63
Weber, Protestant Ethic 544
Weiser, Die Profetie des Amos 275
Wexberg, Individual Psychology 497
What is the Real Hell? 385
Whitehead, Aims of Education 11
Whitham, St. Paul 14

PAGE
Wiegang, Franciscus von Assisi 379
Wiener, Composition of Judges 2^{11} to 1 Kings 2^{46} . 278
Wilder, Bridge of San Luis Rey 46
Williams, Grace of God . 483
" Hebrewisms of West Africa . . 497
Wilson, Problem of Cross . 204
Wiseman, Bible and Immortality of Man . . 165
Wobbermin, Richtlinien evangelischer Theologie . . 378
Wood, Epic of the O.T. . 314
Wright, Miracle in History . 485
Wyclif, Summa de Ente I. . 408
Yahuda, Die Sprache des Pentateuch . . . 54
Yapp, Adventure of Youth . 117
Yellowlees, Psychology's Defence of the Faith . . 350
Young, Popular Preaching . 68
Yule, Who wrote the Fourth Gospel ? . . . 405
Zeitschrift für die Altestamentliche Wissenschaft 42, 278, 379

HEBREW WORDS.

PAGE
אָדָם 56
בַּצִּנּוֹר 141
הָאִישׁ 55
חֲמִשִּׁים 54
הַרְטֻמִּים 54
כֵּן 54
מִצְרַיִם 55
נשק 55
רחף 56
רֵיחַ הַנִּיחֹחַ 57
שַׂר 55
שֶׁבֶר 54
שָׁמַיִם 56
שְׁמַע 55
שָׁנָה . . . . . . 45 f.
תְּהוֹם 56
תּוֹעֵבָה 54

GREEK WORDS.

PAGE
ἐνεδείξατο 22
ἐρχόμενος 93
ἐφ᾽ ὃ πάρει 334
ἥλικον (Ja 3^5) 235
νήφοντες. 43
προπεμφθῆναι 20
πρωί (Jn 1^{41}) 43
συνυπεκρίθησαν 334
τὸ τέλος (1 Co 15^{24}) 504

TEXTS.

PAGE
Gn xiii. 1–4 . . 230
xxii. 6. 434
xxx. 27 . . . 419
Ex. iii. 6 . . 151, 272
xxxiii. 20 . . 365
Dt v. 396
vi. 548
vii. 9 267
xxvi. 2, 4 . . 521
xxxiii. 27 . . 383
Jg v. 8 . . . 140
Job xiv. 14 . . . 412
xviii. 10 . . . 23
1 S iv. 3 553
2 S i. 25, 26 . . 464
v. 6–8 . . . 140
1 K xxi. 6 . . . 517
2 K ii. 1–18 . . 182
xvii. 41 . . 364
Ps viii. 1 . . . 45
xvi. 11 . . . 514
xxxii. 8 . . . 26
xxxvii. 37 . . 44
xlii. 5 514
l. 14 512
lv. 6 463
lxii. 1 131
lxxxvii. 7 . . 290
cxxiv. 2, 3 . . 195
Pr xix. 23 . . . 45
Ec iii. 11 . . . 528
iv. 10 465
ix. 10 . . . 268, 411
Is vii. 14 . . . 391
xi. 6 82
xxx. 15 . . . 131
xli. 8 368
Is lxii. 10 . . . 174
Jer xviii. 4 . . . 324
Ezk iii. 15 . . . 414
Jon iv. 1 . . . 434
Mic vi. 8 . . . 224
Am v. 23, 24 . . 417
Mt i. 16 . . . 390
i. 23 415
ii. 9 137
iii. 9 369
v. 9 58
v. 13 135
vi. 11 148
vi. 33 553
vii. 14 . . . 362
vii. 20 551
x. 39 290
xi. 16–19 . . . 172
xv. 26 . . . 528
xviii. 8 . . . 552
xviii. 9 . . . 383
xx. 28 . . . 53
xxiii. 13 . . . 333
xxiii. 26 . . 76
xxv. 31–46 . . 559
xxvi. 50 . . 334
xxvii. 46 . . 48, 281
Mk x. 18 . . . 294
xi. 22 223
xii. 15 . . . 333
xii. 29 f. . . . 225
xv. 34 . . . 281
Lk i. 5–ii. 52 . . 390
i. 53 556
ii. 12 133
iii. 4 411
ix. 28–31 . . . 376
Lk ix. 51 . . . 274
xii. 6 f. . . . 386
xii. 38 . . . 81
xv. 2 558
xviii. 8 . . . 84
xviii. 19 . . . 294
xxi. 34, 35 . . 229
xxiii. 34 . . 103
xxiii. 39–43 . . 151
xxiii. 46 . . 427
Jn i. 14 . . . 130
i. 41 43
ii. 3 107
iv. 34–42 . . . 141
v. 17 178
x. 18 270
xiv. 1 466
xiv. 2 412
xiv. 6 240
xiv. 9 365
xvi. 22 . . . 329
xix. 26, 27 . . 198
xix. 28 . . . 317
xix. 30 . . . 343
Ac ii. 36 . . . 151
xv. 29 . . . 128
xxvii. 13 . . 172
Ro i. 16 227
ii. 16 227
viii. 9 367
ix. 19–24 . . . 484
xii. 6 484
xv. 6 468
1 Co ix. 1 5
ix. 2 171
ix. 22 79
xiii. 8 196
1 Co xiii. 12 . . 519
xv. 503
xv. 12 325
xv. 19 326
xv. 53. 515
2 Co i. 3 269
v. 9 176
v. 16 5
Gal i. 14 484
Eph ii. 6 414
iii. 21 335
iv. 6 30
iv. 28 237
v. 19 129
Ph i. 12 134
iv. 8, 9 323
Col iii. 1 462
1 Th i. 3. 328
i. 5 227
iv. 10 f. . . . 25
v. 1, 8. . . . 25
2 Ti i. 5 331
i. 6 75
ii. 3 24
ii. 23–26 . . . 235
Heb iv. 15 . . . 294
xi. 9 513
Ja iii. 5 235
iii. 17 363
1 P i. 13 43
iii. 18 f. . . . 44
1 Jn iii. 12 . . . 180
iv. 8 148
iv. 10 555
Rev iii. 2 . . . 28
xix. 13 77

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

As this number is not only the first of a new volume, but also marks the beginning of the forty-first year of the Magazine, a short Foreword may be permitted. There have been letters of congratulation, very encouraging to receive, from all parts of the globe, and some of them from men who had subscribed from the very first number. Of Dr. Hastings' first number a contemporary wrote that he saw in it at once 'the promise and the potency and the certainty of life.' He was right in his forecast, for the circulation not only holds its own but increases steadily year by year. Nor does the standpoint change. Dr. Moffatt once described it as 'a steady adherence to the beliefs of Christianity, interpreted by the fresh results of criticism. Men came to see,' Dr. Moffatt continued, 'that Dr. Hastings knew how these could be held without evasion, and that he was ready to put the best available information at the disposal of not only scholars but his fellow Ministers.'

All the old features will be found in the new volume. The surveys of 'Recent Foreign Theology,' which keep readers in touch with everything of importance in theological thought abroad, will, as formerly, be in the capable hands of Professors J. E. McFadyen, Moffatt, H. R. Mackintosh, Tasker, and Principal A. E. Garvie.

The sermons given 'In the Study' will again follow The Christian Year. Readers might note that MSS. of children's sermons for special occasions should reach us two months before the date for which they are intended.

'Entre Nous,' besides its usual items, will contain from time to time studies of the religious motif in some of the best contemporary fiction.

In 1929 to 1930 there will be three new series of articles. One will survey the contribution of Britain, America, France, and Germany respectively to Old Testament science, New Testament science, Systematic Theology, and Church History. The Old Testament articles will be done by Professor J. M. Powis Smith, Chicago (America); Professor A. R. Gordon, Montreal (Germany); and Dr. Arthur R. Siebens, Chicago (France). Germany's contribution in the other fields will be surveyed by Professor Völlrath, Erlangen (Systematic Theology); Professor James Mackinnon, Edinburgh (Church History); and Professor Dr. Martin Dibelius, Heidelberg (N.T.). Fuller particulars will appear later.

'The Cries from the Cross' will be the subject of the expository series of studies.

Under the general title 'The Mind of Christ on Moral Problems of To-day,' pressing ethical questions will be discussed, such as marriage, wealth, war, self-expression, commercial morality, education, and women and the ministry. Canon Charles E. Raven will write on the last named, and Professor John M'Murray on self-expression. Contributors whose articles will appear shortly will include The Bishop of Winchester; Dean Inge; Dean Simpson; Professor B. W. Bacon, 'The Blessing of the Peacemakers'; Rev. F. J. Rae, 'Education and Religion'; Dr. Rendel Harris, 'A Western Gloss in John 2[3]'; Professor A. J. Gossip; Professor Fulton; Principal W. M. M'Gregor; Professor J. A. Robertson; Professor W. A. Curtis, 'A Study of our Lord's Temptation'; Rev. J. A. Morrison, 'Miracle and Natural Law'; and Mrs. J. A. Robertson, 'Religion and the Drama.' It is hoped also to survey soon the present position of Archæological Study.

Vol. XLI.—No. 1.—October 1929.

The Fourth Gospel seems to be coming back to its own among scholars, and if so, this will be a great boon not only to Christian thought, but to the ordinary Bible reader. For a considerable time we have been accustomed to see this Gospel and its witness put aside because of the uncertainty of date and authorship. The Synoptists have alone been treated as an authority on the ministry of Christ. The result of all this has been a neglect of St. John which has seriously impoverished Christian faith. The trend back to a more positive and confident position has been definite and reassuring.

Canon Scott Holland did excellent service some years ago by his little book in which he pointed out that a ministry of Jesus in Jerusalem was so likely that for Jesus to neglect the centre of His people's faith and life was unthinkable. Lord Charnwood as a layman also made a helpful contribution. But it is Dr. BERNARD's great work on the Gospel that has, as it were, concentrated the trend towards a new confidence in it. Two of the reviews have long and elaborate articles on Dr. BERNARD's commentary—the *Church Quarterly*, and the *London Quarterly*. It may be useful to summarize briefly the points to which the two writers draw attention.

First about the authorship, and along with that naturally the historical trustworthiness. It is generally agreed to-day that the author knew Mark and Luke, and freely corrected them. Further, it is agreed that the book is the work of an Aramaic, not a Greek, mind. Also, that, when the chronology of the Fourth Gospel conflicts with that of the Synoptists, the former is to be preferred. There is general agreement that the Gospel was written between 90 and 98. And there is a general agreement to attribute it, if not to an eye-witness, at least to an intimate acquaintance of an eye-witness.

Dr. BERNARD believes that the Gospel was written by 'John the Presbyter.' But the 'ultimate author' was the Apostle John. He was the 'witness' to whom the writer refers. And therefore it is his evidence the Gospel contains for the words and deeds of Jesus. Just as Mark has the authority of Peter behind it, though *written* by Mark, so the Fourth Gospel, though *written* by the Presbyter, has the authority of John the Apostle behind it. This is an attractive theory, because it explains how the words of Jesus have filtered through another mind and been modified in the process. It explains the difference in form of the teaching of Jesus in the Synoptists and in St. John.

But the writer of the *Church Quarterly* article refuses to follow Dr. BERNARD in this matter. And he has a good deal to say for himself. His main point about 'John the Presbyter' is that there was no such person. The authority for his existence is a famous passage in Papias who refers to 'the Presbyter John.' The *Church Quarterly* writer, Mr. Fremenheere, contends that this was the Apostle. The Apostles were referred to as elders. Peter calls himself an elder (1 P 5^1). In short, there was only one John. Further, to clinch the matter, it is pointed out that the Gospel actually identifies the *writer* of the Gospel and the *witness* to its facts: 'the disciple who is witnessing concerning these things and wrote these things' (Jn 21^{24}). If 'John the Presbyter' is disposed of, then there remains only the Apostle as the sole author.

Another point of great importance is the relation of the Fourth Gospel to the Synoptists. This is generally represented as one of contrast, greatly to the prejudice of the Fourth Gospel. The Synoptists are historical, the Fourth Gospel is unhistorical. An effort has even been made, as in the able book of Dr. L. A. Muirhead, to show that the incidents in John are allegories, not facts. This contrast is, however, fast disappearing under the hands of scholars. The tradition in John is in some respects proved to be more primitive than that in the Synoptists. Dr. BERNARD contends that the Fourth Gospel represents faithfully John's picture of Jesus Christ. Matthew Arnold's opinion is quoted that 'the fundamental themes of Jesus [in John] we maintain to be no "arid mysteries" at all, but to be in profound unison with "the sublime and pregnant discourses of the Sea of Galilee";

and we do not see who was capable of uttering them but Jesus.'

The special point of contrast which used to be maintained was the Christology of John. It was regarded as very different from that of the Synoptists. But closer study has dissipated this impression. The claims made for Jesus in Mark are as high as any that could be made. Further, there is nothing in John which is not implicit in Paul's Epistles, and these were written and published before the Gospels. In short, the contrast between the Synoptists and John, which was one of the strongest influences weakening the hold of the Fourth Gospel on Christian minds, does not exist. It is one of the great merits of Dr. BERNARD's great work that he has made this clear in detail.

In many quarters we hear of the necessity of a restatement of Christian dogma in view of modern thought, and naturally we turn with interest to what is probably the most recent discussion of this subject. It is contained in the composite volume, *Dogma* (reviewed in another column), and comes from the pen of Professor H. Maurice RELTON of King's College, London, with whose essay of forty-six pages on 'The Reconstruction of Dogma' the volume concludes.

The essay begins with an attempt to define Christianity. This is natural enough, as it is the dogmatic effort of Christianity that is *sub judice.* But the author might well have compressed this discussion and left more space for the development of his views on the nature of the reconstructed dogma. While we say this, we appreciate the point that a discussion of the question whether the original Christianity is truly represented by the phrase 'Jesus the worshipper' in contradistinction to the phrase 'Jesus worshipped' is a necessary preliminary to the question of the need of the reconstruction of historical Christianity in the light of modern thought.

For answer to the question, What was Christianity? Dr. RELTON maintains that the life of Jesus of Nazareth cannot be divorced from the Life of the Christ of the Creeds, as this is witnessed to by Christian experience. Accordingly he finds at the heart of the Christian religion nothing less than the Dogma of the God-Man. Christianity must stand or fall ultimately, he says, by its adherence to or rejection of this concept of the Incarnation.

It follows that, if this be true, the Christian philosopher is committed to some form of Dualism. He is not free to accept either an absolute Monism or a thoroughgoing Pluralism as the solution of the Cosmic problem. But neither absolute Monism nor thoroughgoing Pluralism, nor indeed any other system of philosophy, is within measurable distance of being *the* philosophy of the twentieth century, and therefore *the* philosophy in terms of which we must present our faith for acceptance to-day. Thus we need not be afraid of being philosophically out of court if we seek to ally ourselves with a Dualistic type of philosophy.

On the other hand, restatement in terms of modern thought to-day is hindered by the fact that philosophical opinion is in a chaos. It is also hindered by the fact that the results of historical and Biblical study are as yet insufficiently determinate for the purposes of a restatement comparable in scope to that of the ancient formularies. Indeed Dr. RELTON is so impressed by the magnitude of these hindrances that the time does not appear to him to be ripe for a re-formulation of the Christian Faith.

But there is one modern philosophy, he avers, in which the doctrine of the Incarnation as the Church conceives it can find no adequate place. It is the modern philosophy of change, by which he means the philosophy which, abandoning the concept of Transcendence with the associated ideas of creation and a twofold order—heavenly and earthly—of reality, reads reality not as Being but as Becoming, not as a static changelessness but as a dynamic change. Such a philosophy appears to leave no room for that conception of God in relation to the world and human life which is indissolubly bound up with the Dogma of the God-Man. If the modern philosophy of change cannot entertain the concept of Transcendence, Christian theology can have no part with it.

What kind of synthesis, then, between the concepts of Immanence and Transcendence is needed if we are to build up a distinctive Christian philosophy in which the full content of our Christian Faith shall find adequate intellectual formulation? It is the synthesis for which Christian Theism stands. Christian Theism lifts the whole problem of the One and the Many, of Monism and Pluralism, of Transcendence and Immanence, into the realm of ethical and spiritual, as distinguished from ontological, relationships. It deals in terms of personality. It is committed to the concept of finite created personality in relation to the Absolute Personality of God. In this concept alone is contained the view of the relation of God to the world which is most consistent with the whole content of experience, including, as this must, religious experience, or the experience of the soul in communion with God.

Dr. Relton concludes by describing the kind of basis upon which he would reconstruct dogma in terms of modern thought. It would be upon the threefold foundation of Tradition, Reason, and Experience. A theology thus constructed would be saved at once from traditionalism, intellectualism, and emotionalism.

It would seek to do justice to historical Christianity as this presents itself in the form of the Catholic Faith supernaturally originated and historically mediated. It would submit the Catholic Faith to the considered judgment of the human reason. It would also submit the Catholic Faith as thus tested and judged to the verdict of disciplined experience. If such a presentation of historical Christianity critically sifted were found to answer to the needs of human life, we should be justified in regarding it as an adequate and satisfying reconstruction of dogma.

Who was the Rich Young Ruler who came to Jesus and asked about eternal life? The Rev. T. A. Moxon believes firmly that it was St. Paul, and he gives his reasons in a rather fascinating article in the current *Church Quarterly Review* with the title 'Did St. Paul see Jesus Christ in the Flesh?' The writer begins by insisting that the invitation Jesus extended to the young man was one to apostleship. It was couched in exactly the same terms as Jesus used when He called Peter and Andrew and Matthew: 'Leave all and *follow me.*' If the young man was St. Paul, then this was his call to apostleship and his title to be regarded as one of the band.

The proof of the identification proceeds on two lines. The first claim is that the description given of the Young Ruler is in complete harmony with all we know of Paul's early life. St. Luke tells us that he was a 'ruler,' which means a prominent young member of the sect of the Pharisees. But we know of St. Paul that he was just that. He was educated in Jerusalem as a Pharisee under Gamaliel, and he was evidently destined for a high place in the official body. Again, when we remember Paul's deep dissatisfaction with the Law, and his autobiographical statement of this in Ro 7, is not this an echo of the young ruler's 'all these have I kept, but there is a lack yet'?

Again, the young man had 'great possessions.' Now Paul was obviously poor. But he cannot have been of a poor family. He had an expensive education. And, as Ramsay pointed out in 'St. Paul the Traveller,' his long stay at Cæsarea in 'free custody' was only possible to a man of means. Besides, Felix evidently expected a large bribe from him. And finally, the appeal to Cæsar was a very costly business. Ramsay suggests that Paul had inherited the family fortune at this time. In any case he had been a 'rich young ruler.' Is it not more than possible that, when he became a Christian, he obeyed the demand of Jesus to give up his wealth and position?

Further, it is often assumed that Paul was absent from Jerusalem when Jesus was there. But what ground is there for this assumption? He was brought up in Jerusalem; he had family links with the city; he had a nephew there; he was residing there shortly after the birth of the Church. The incident of the Young Ruler occurred shortly before the Crucifixion, and Paul's presence at the same time may be regarded as probable.

Finally, there are two statements of Paul's which appear to be conclusive in support of the belief that he had personal dealings with our Lord, and any attempt to explain them away seems to be an abuse of the plain meaning of words. The first is in 2 Co 5^{16}, 'Yea, though we have known Christ after the flesh, yet now henceforth know we him no more.' The second is 1 Co 9^{1}, 'Am I not an apostle? . . . Have I not seen Jesus Christ our Lord?' Most commentators refer these words to the vision on the Damascus road. But, as a matter of fact, Paul is maintaining, in answer to his critics, that he has had personal knowledge of Jesus Christ, and claims the title of apostle on that ground. If his only claim was the vision on the road to Damascus, the claim is pretty thin. But if Paul had seen Jesus and received the call 'follow me,' then his claim was unanswerable.

The second ground on which Mr. Moxon identifies Paul and the Young Ruler is that, if it is valid, certain incidents in Paul's life are explained that would otherwise be inexplicable. This part of the article is not so persuasive as the first part. But the trend of it is very much as follows. The 'goads' against which Paul had evidently been kicking were the thoughts and feelings aroused in him by the words of Jesus when He demanded a full surrender. They had been rankling in his mind, and he had tried to still them by his fierce opposition to the infant Church. The incident of the Gospels explains the whole of Paul's inner life before his conversion.

◆

A. S. Peake.

By Principal W. B. Selbie, D.D., Mansfield College, Oxford.

I first came to know Peake when he was an undergraduate of St. John's College, Oxford, and we were both studying theology. We used to meet at Dr. Fairbairn's house, at various lectures, and at debating societies, and soon struck up a firm friendship. He was a quiet, gentle, unassuming little man, delicate even then, with no capacity for games, and taking little or no interest in ordinary undergraduate pursuits. By the student he was set down as a smug, but to those who really knew him he soon stood out as a man of mark. His conversational powers were extraordinary. We often spent the afternoon in a dinghy on the upper river—I sculling, while he steered a most erratic course, talking all the time. His subject was theology in some shape or form. We were both attending the lectures of Driver, Cheyne, and Sanday, and making acquaintance for the first time with the higher criticism of the Bible, then a new, and to most people rather terrible, thing. Peake reacted to it very characteristically. He had been brought up in the old orthodoxy, but with a minute knowledge of, and intense affection for, the Bible. But he was very conscious of the difficulties which the old position raised, and he welcomed Pentateuch criticism in particular as an obvious way out. He set himself to master it, and was never weary of discussing the problem how to make criticism positive and constructive, an aid to faith rather than a hindrance. His whole bent of mind in these early and formative years but anticipated what was afterwards to become his life's work. He won the Denyer and Johnson Theological Scholarship, and took a first-class in the school, and immediately on taking his degree was appointed tutor in Hebrew and Old Testament in Mansfield College. No sooner had he begun work there than he was elected to a Theological Fellowship at Merton. At the time this was a remarkable appointment, seeing that he was a layman and a Nonconformist, and could only have been possible in the case of a very exceptional man. Peake continued to teach at Merton and Mansfield together, but only for a short time. His heart was with his own people, and when he was called to teach theology in the Primitive Methodist College at Manchester, he felt that there was his life's work. So indeed it proved. At the Hartley College, the Lancashire Independent College, and in the then newly formed theological faculty of Manchester University he found a unique opportunity, and used it to the full. Many generations of theological students passed through his hands, and on all of them he left his mark. In his own denomination, Peake's men stand out for their scholarly equipment combined with evangelical power and zeal.

It should always be remembered that Peake was a convinced and loyal Primitive Methodist. His father was one of their ministers, and his own deep religious experience owed much to the warm evangelical atmosphere of his Mother Church. He never forgot this debt, for it meant more than a mere denominational attachment. He had passed through a religious crisis in his youth that determined his theological outlook. His interest in Paulinism, for example, and his deep understanding of it, are not to be explained by any merely academic reasons. They were the outcome of a sympathy born of a kindred experience. In many respects Peake was the most competent modern exponent of the mind of St. Paul, and to those who knew him the reason was not far to seek. To him, as to the Apostle, sin, redemption, and the grace of God in Jesus Christ were among the supreme experiences of life, and he brought to the interpretation of the Apostle's expression of his experience a knowledge born of sympathy. In writing and lecturing on St. Paul he always made it clear that he was dealing with the really fundamental things of the Christian life and faith. So far from finding in Paulinism an excrescence on the original Christian stock, as men not infrequently do, he came to regard it, and indeed to preach it, as the best key to the secret of Christianity. He always contended that St. Paul must be studied with the heart as much as with the head, and he was really speaking of himself when he said, 'The secret of the spell which the theology of Paul has cast on such multitudes is to be found in the illumination which it has brought to their own spiritual history.'

Looking back on Peake's work as a whole, it becomes quite clear that the most important feature of it was his power of mediating to ordinary people the results of Biblical criticism, and of modern theological study generally. He owed this partly to his training, and partly to his strategic denominational position, but mainly to his own genius for combining spiritual fervour and devotion with ripe scholarship and intellectual honesty. While at Oxford he had been greatly influenced by Fairbairn, particularly in regard to the apologetic presentation of historical Christianity in relation to the great religions of the world. Fairbairn's pioneer work in this direction has perhaps never been appreciated at its true value. Peake realized to the full its timeliness, and carried the work forward in his own way. There were certain limitations in Fairbairn's outlook on modern theology which Peake was able to transcend, and, though he went much further than Fairbairn, he never failed to reckon himself as his disciple. His patient and exact scholarship gave him here a great advantage. More than any man of his time, he could, and did, write with authority both on the Old and the New Testaments. His work on the Epistle to the Hebrews and on Paulinism, on Isaiah, and on the problem of suffering in the Old Testament reveals him as an expert in a very wide field, and it may truly be said of him that in the realm of Biblical study he touched nothing that he did not adorn. And it was all done so simply and unostentatiously, without any parade of learning, and in language that any one could understand. Peake had an astonishing facility for dealing with great problems in a short compass, and yet clearly and effectively.

Such a book, to take only one example, as *Christianity, its Nature and Truth*, a collection of papers originally contributed to a popular magazine, contains at once an apologetic and a dogmatic—a restatement of the Christian faith in terms of the new knowledge. It is critical and yet thoroughly constructive, and that in a large free way that takes it well out of the category of an *ad hoc* apology. It is written, too, with such clarity and simplicity as to bring it within the reach of quite uninstructed readers. The same, too, may be said of his really great book on the Bible, with its characteristic sub-title, 'Its Origin, Significance, and Abiding Worth.' Though it appeared some years ago, it has never been superseded, and is still the best book available for the serious student who wishes to obtain a complete survey of the whole field of Biblical criticism within a conveniently short compass. The writer of such a book has necessarily to commit himself to expressing his judgment on many disputed points. Here Peake excels and shows himself to be a really competent guide. He never sits on the fence, and never yields to extravagance. Where he thinks it well to suspend judgment he says so, and gives his reasons, and his definite decisions are generally so well backed up that it is very difficult to quarrel with them. And he never suffers his reader to forget that to him the Bible is the Word of God and a very sacred thing. He never loses the saint in the scholar.

Peake's Biblical work culminated in his now famous one volume Commentary on the Bible, in which he secured the co-operation of many eminent scholars. Much of it he wrote himself, and he took his duties as Editor very seriously, supervising the whole, and leaving his mark upon it. It had an astonishing success, and it is quite legitimate that it should be known everywhere as 'Peake's' Commentary. It was written, of course, throughout from a soberly critical point of view. In spite of its moderation, however, it proved too much for those in all the Churches who are known as fundamentalists. Peake was astonished and a little distressed at the amount of vituperative and even threatening correspondence he received. He used to confess rather ruefully that if he required any proof of the need for such a work he had received it in abundance. But the work remains: an abiding monument of its editor's insight and skill.

It must not be supposed, however, that Peake was a scholar and nothing more. He was a great teacher, administrator, and preacher, and he brought to all his practical work the same shrewd common sense and deeply religious spirit that he showed in his studies. To his students he was a hero as well as a master. They learned from him the joy of intellectual achievement, for he taught them to think for themselves, and not remain mere echoes. As Dean of the Theological Faculty, Vice-Chancellor of the University, President of the Free Church Council, Editor of the *Holborn Review*, and a member of endless committees and conferences he showed a quiet sagacity that made his counsel always welcome, and gave him an ever-increasing influence. Though he preferred to remain a layman, he took an active part in Church work, and very frequently preached. He excelled in extempore speech, was clear, direct, incisive, and appealing. He would give an hour's address or lecture without a single note, and with no loss of coherence. His voice was weak but penetrating, and his simple earnestness drove his message home. If preaching is the impartation of truth through personality, Peake had the gift to a remarkable degree. The man behind the sermon made the sermon count.

And all this was done by a man with a frail physique never far removed from invalidism. At one time he had to spend long periods lying on his back, but the work went on all the same. He used gleefully to admit that one reason why he was able to get through so much was that he gave to work the hours that most men spent in exercise. Yet he was no recluse. He loved intercourse with his fellows, shone in conversation, and had a great fund of good stories. He was keenly interested in every phase of life, and on social and political questions wielded an undoubted influence, especially among his own people. He did not shrink from controversy, as when the Education struggle was in its acute stages, but his spirit was eirenic, and he had no love for strife. He took an eager part in various conferences on Church reunion, and rejoiced in the accomplishment of Methodist union as at least a step in the right direction. But he had no illusions as to the difficulties in the way of union between the Free Churches and the Anglican. He felt that the time for it was not yet, that much spade-work had yet to be done on both sides, and a better mutual understanding to be secured. Probably no Free Church leader was ever more respected, trusted, and even loved by those who differed from him most widely. When Oxford opened her divinity degrees to others than Anglicans, he was chosen to be one of the first three to receive the honorary D.D. from his old University. I think he felt it to be the crowning honour of his career. He leaves behind him a stainless name and a memory of quiet but immensely effective service of God and man. Himself *anima naturaliter Christiana*, he made Christianity a more real and living thing to his generation. All the Churches are in his debt, but none so deeply as those 'Primitives' whom he loved and so loyally served. That they bring with them so fine a contribution to United Methodism is due to this one man, Arthur Samuel Peake.

◆

Literature.

DOGMA.

The substance of a recently published composite volume, *Dogma* (Nisbet; 8s. 6d. net), was given as a course of public lectures at King's College, London, during the Michaelmas Term, 1928. The contributors, says Dean W. R. Matthews, who edits the volume, are all convinced that 'the Christian faith must be set in relation with the thought and science of the modern world,' and that it 'has the inherent power of truth to adapt itself to the intellectual conditions of every age.' Their contributions, which are studies of dogma in history and thought, are unequal in scope and style, nor are they consistent with each other in their respective attitudes towards the dogmatic effort of the past. Thus Mr. Hanson, whose subject is 'Dogma in Mediæval Scholasticism,' concentrates upon the dualistic aspect of mediæval theology, offers the best-written study, and shows himself the most intransigent, or—shall we rather say?—the least sympathetic with post-Kantian thought of all the seven contributors.

The editor discusses 'The Nature and Basis of Dogma,' emphasizing the symbolical character of religious knowledge and the aspect of tradition as a growing experience. Dr. Bicknell's subject is 'Dogma in the New Testament'; he also emphasizes the pictorial and symbolical ('mythological') character of doctrine, and holds that the dogmatic statements of the New Testament are able to convey truth in a form still adequate for life and worship. Dr. Gore, dealing with 'Dogma in the Early Church,' gives an historical statement of the patristic idea of 'the tradition,' and seeks to vindicate the Anglican rule of faith, with its particular appeal to the Bible, and especially to the New Testament. 'Dogma in Protestant Scholasticism' is the subject of a very useful and informative survey by Principal Franks. Dr. Jenkins writes with intimate learning on 'The Decline of Dogma and the Anti-dogmatic Movement,' but his contribution lacks definiteness and point. 'The Reconstruction of Dogma' is the important subject assigned to Dr. Relton. He comes really to grips with his subject when halfway through his essay, and the only points he has time to make are that the Christian doctrine of the Incarnation, which is for him the essence of dogma, can find no adequate place for itself in an immanentist philosophy, and that the reconstructed dogma should be on the threefold basis of Tradition, Reason, and Experience. In this final contribution there is no traffic with modernist theology, and it may serve to illustrate once more what we have said as to the varying intellectual attitudes of the contributors: Dr. Relton appears to mediate between the editor and Mr. Hanson.

PERSONALITY.

Ourselves and Reality, by Mr. Ernest G. Braham, M.A. (Epworth Press; 10s. 6d. net), is an extremely able discussion of personality in the light of the best modern philosophic and scientific thought. The treatise is in three parts. The first contains critical studies of British and American idealism represented by T. H. Green, Bradley, Bosanquet, Royce, and MacTaggart. The second treats of the reaction from idealism in Lotze, Martineau, William James, James Ward, and A. N. Whitehead. The third offers 'a constructive theory of personalism.' The reader is made to feel throughout that he is in the hands of a competent guide. The exposition is clear and masterly, the criticisms acute and the judgments balanced and weighty. One or two minor points may be noted. It is hardly a fair statement to say that Calvin regarded free will as 'incompatible with the divine decrees.' Professor J. S. Haldane (referred to as J. B. S. Haldane) is credited in the index with the authorship of 'The Reign of Relativity.' If Mr. Braham had had the opportunity of reading Professor Haldane's recently published Gifford Lectures on 'The Sciences and Philosophy' his reference on page 260 to Professor Haldane's position would have been fuller, and probably his whole treatment of the relation of body and mind would have been modified. Considerable attention is devoted to the philosophy of Whitehead, and the interesting suggestion is made that his 'position is basically similar to that of St. Thomas Aquinas.' 'When Whitehead has made a further elucidation of his theistic position, based upon his metaphysic of Nature, it may be that it will not be an approximation to that of St. Thomas Aquinas, but identical, and that we shall have the unexpected phenomenon of the new philosophy of Nature confirming orthodox Christian Theism.' In formulating his constructive theory of personalism Mr. Braham lays stress on the uniqueness of individuality as being 'the veritable core of personality,' he argues ably for the interaction theory of the relation of body and mind, and he 'pleads for a more consistent Theism, which says that God is not only possible but *real, not "coming into existence, but actually existent; not only in the process, but dominating it."'* Dealing with the question of personal immortality he reviews the various evidences—empirical, metaphysical, ethical, and religious, and finds his surest ground in the last. 'Belief in God is not only an ethical demand, but belief based upon the nature of God . . . the whole doctrine hangs upon the great reality of a God who is love.' An able and reassuring book, worthy in an eminent degree of its high theme.

JESUS-JESHUA.

If any one has earned the right to discuss the language and the *milieu* of Jesus it is Gustaf Dalman. This he has done with his customary fulness and exactness of knowledge in a book with the curious title *Jesus-Jeshua* (S.P.C.K.; 15s. net), a title which suggests two of the languages, Greek and Hebrew, which, Dalman argues, Jesus must have known, the other being Aramaic. Jesus could not have lived in isolation from the influence of Greek. Two of His disciples (Andrew and Philip), with their Greek names, were apparently related to the Greek cultural circle; the Syro-Phœnician woman with whom Jesus conversed was in respect of language a Greek; and the Greek text of the Gospels may be regarded as a thoroughly 'sound bridge' over the gap between us and the original words of our Lord. At the same time Hebrew did not entirely drop out of the life of the Jewish people, and the parents of Jesus would see that He should be instructed in the Torah and therefore also in Hebrew.

At the same time there is no doubt that Aramaic was the mother-tongue of Jesus, a few specimens of which survive in our Greek Gospels. Aramaic prayers must have been used in the Synagogue worship, and the whole matter is thus summed up by Dalman: 'To the two languages which our Lord knew (Aramaic, His mother-tongue, and Greek, the language of the government and of the foreign inhabitants of the land) must also be added as a third—Hebrew, the language of His Bible.'

The bulk of the book, however, is taken up with discussions of the Synagogue Service, The Preacher on the Mount, The Passover Meal, and the Cross, with the words of Jesus spoken from it. The interest of these discussions is very much more than linguistic, no fewer than ninety-nine pages, for example, are devoted to the Passover Meal alone. But no small part of the value of Dalman's book is that he perpetually keeps before us the Aramaic equivalents for the Greek phrases and sentences of our Gospels, and thus, by illustrations drawn from Rabbinic parallels, he carries us as near the actual words of Jesus as it is possible for us, through a study of language, to come. It will be news for many to learn that the 'But I say' of the Sermon on the Mount has Rabbinic analogies. 'The contrasting of one's own opinion with that of others is not rare in the legal discussions of the Rabbis.' One Rabbi asserted his opinion five times against the famous Akiba in the words, 'Behold, *he* says . . . but *I* say' (*wa-ani 'ōmēr*). An appendix deals with Jewish proverbs and maxims, some of which are paralleled in the Gospels, and there is a valuable list of important New Testament verses in Aramaic. The book has been well translated by the Rev. Paul P. Levertoff.

THE CHRISTIAN DOCTRINE OF GOD.

All that comes from the pen of Professor H. R. Mackintosh bears the stamp of sound scholarship and of sane and consistent thinking. He never soars into the clouds of speculation, but he sees his subject steadily and from all sides, and he sees deep into the heart of it. These qualities are again manifest in *The Christian Apprehension of God* (S.C.M.; 6s. net), a course of lectures delivered at the Union Theological Seminary, Richmond, Virginia. There are eight lectures in all, the first three dealing with the nature of religion and the idea of revelation, the other five dealing with the Christian conception of God—His personality, holiness, love, and sovereign purpose. Professor Mackintosh finds religion rooted in a fundamental human need of God. 'Atheism is a relatively modern product, and the attempt to place it near the outset of the human development would not now be repeated by any serious scholar.' He regards as a 'calamitous delusion' the idea 'that the lowest and least developed Nature-religions now extant afford a fairly exact picture of religion in its earliest form, and that by inspection of these we can tell how religion as such originated.' His treatment of the idea of revelation is a fine piece of exposition, well fitted to clear away much haziness of thought. Coming to the Christian doctrine of God, he paints a convincing picture in which holiness and love are seen in beautiful harmony. The love of God to a world of sinners is not to be taken for granted as an easy and axiomatic thing; on the contrary, 'the paradoxical and astounding character of the Divine love' is to be emphasized. The lectures conclude with a careful discussion of the sovereign purpose of God in which the essential truth of Calvinism is set forth as 'a profound religious idea from which serenity and courage arise.' Few writers have such a gift of clear thinking lit with the steady glow of spiritual fervour.

RELIGION AND ITS NEW TESTAMENT EXPRESSION.

Religion and its New Testament Expression, by the Rev. H. Bulcock, B.D. (Williams & Norgate; 10s. 6d. net), is said to be 'chiefly intended for the general thoughtful reader,' but its discussions are somewhat too technical to be of interest to any but serious students of religious psychology and Biblical criticism. For them an ample feast is provided, though the various ingredients may not suit every palate. The Christianity here presented is practically independent of the historic Christ. 'His influence might in large measure have been felt by us, transmitted through a succession of Christian personalities, without the origin of their influence being actually known to us.' The title very aptly indicates the writer's method. The first part of his book is devoted to an elaborate study of the religious consciousness which by its intuitions gives us a knowledge of God and immortality. In part two the Christian Gospel is treated as little more than an illustration of these intuitions. 'It may indeed seem that our main thesis that the Love of God is sensed as a cosmic intuition renders superfluous any revelation of the Love of God through the historic life and work of Jesus; on the other hand, the mystic intuitions belonging to the world of Being must have their parallel facts in the processes of that world of Becoming in which we normally think, feel, and act.' The criticism of the New Testament writings is radical. Miracles are summarily rejected. 'What have they to do with faith? What credential do they give to Jesus?' The story of the Resurrection, 'if denied, would by no means involve the collapse of vital faith.' The developments of Christian doctrine in the Epistles are traced to their sources in Hellenism and the Mysteries. With all this the writer expresses a deep and worshipful devotion to the personality and teaching of Jesus, and makes the claim that he has been enabled 'to separate the eternal truth from the temporary form, and to relieve those who seek the fellowship of faith from an alien burden of unscientific first-century thought and even elements of semi-paganism.' He is hopeful that all this may be 'a factor of reconciliation between some of the sections of a divided Christendom.'

THE OLD TESTAMENT IN THE SCHOOL.

No education can be complete without religious instruction, and no religious instruction can be adequate which ignores the Bible. It is, perhaps, not unnatural that in Christian instruction the New Testament should hold a more secure place than the Old, nevertheless 'the literature of the Old Testament is far too precious to be neglected.' These words are taken from the Preface of *An Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament*, by Mr. F. Fairbrother, M.Sc., Headmaster of the Cedars School, Leighton Buzzard, and Professor D. Russell Scott, M.A., Ph.D., Late Pusey and Ellerton Scholar in the University of Oxford (James Clarke; 5s. net), and the book is warmly commended in a Foreword by John Strong, C.B.E., M.A., LL.D., Professor of Education in the University of Leeds.

The book is designed to meet the needs especially of senior pupils in schools, and it meets them admirably, as one would expect, considering that, while one of the writers is a well-known Biblical scholar, the other is an experienced and successful teacher. The authors have resisted the temptation to overload their book with minutiæ for which the average boy has neither time nor inclination. Every book of the Old Testament is dealt with, but with a brevity which obliges the authors to confine the discussion to things of vital importance. Throughout the volume the results of sober criticism are presupposed, and the teachers or pupils who use it may be assured that the presentation of the literature is thoroughly modern; they will have nothing in later life to unlearn. The treatment is clear and frank; the sources of the Pentateuch are briefly explained, the differences between the prose and the poetical versions of the story of Deborah in Jg 4 f. are carefully noted, the divergences in Samuel are candidly acknowledged, the three parts of Isaiah (1–39, 40–55, 56–66) appear at different parts of the volume, which is at pains to trace the development of prophecy by setting the prophetical books in their chronological order, and the little poem, Is 63[1-6], is described as 'reflecting Jewish nationalism at its worst,' and inspired by a narrow patriotism 'which has led to much strife among the nations.'

One notable feature of the volume is that it indicates and summarizes passages of special interest and importance—in Ezekiel, for example, not only the well-known Vision of the Valley of

Dry Bones (37), but the striking, though less well-known, Dirge over Tyre (27). And better still, many passages remarkable either for their spiritual teaching or their literary beauty are printed *in extenso*, for example, Hos 14, Mic 6^{6-8}, Song of Songs $8^{6ff.}$, and the four Songs of the Suffering Servant in Deutero-Isaiah. This very commendable feature, which brings the pupil face to face with the actual text, should be of peculiar value to a generation which is more inclined to read *about* the Bible than to read the Bible itself. The chapter on the Psalter offers a good list of representative psalms.

The writers describe the object of their book thus: 'to provide a readable introduction to the literature of the Old Testament, and it is hoped that readers will gain a clear insight into the development of Israel.' The description is just, and the hope is justified by the simple, lucid, and scientific treatment of the material. We would very especially commend the book to senior scholars of our day schools, to teachers, and to all who are interested in the religious education of the young.

A SOCIAL GOSPEL.

Are the teachings of Christ social as well as religious and moral? If so, whence do they derive and whither do they lead? These are questions which Professor C. C. McCown, D.D., has set out to answer in *The Genesis of the Social Gospel* (Williams & Norgate; 12s. 6d. net). The book contains the results of a careful and learned inquiry into all the material and spiritual conditions that played a part in the making of the Jewish people of Christ's day—the physical features of Palestine, the history of Israel, the religion of the prophets, together with all the varied streams of influence which flowed in from Egypt, Babylonia, and Persia. Much less space is given to the exposition of Jesus' teaching on social questions. Here it would appear that the writer has hardly given due weight to the element of originality in the spirit and teaching of Jesus. The 'negative attitude' of Jesus to property 'is to be interpreted merely as a natural expression of the nomadic-agricultural ideal which belonged to the cultural tradition of his race.' 'A simple life rejoicing in the good things of the world and in happy companionship with one's fellows, without envy, enmity, greed, censoriousness, or struggle for precedence and power, such is Jesus' ideal of life as one discovers it in the Synoptic Gospels.' This seems strangely inadequate, even when allowance is made for the fact that the writer is dealing solely with the social side of the gospel. There is very much, however, in the whole treatment which is both true and instructive, while in regard to the historical summary of antecedents which occupies the major part of the book it would not be easy to find elsewhere so comprehensive an account of the material environment and spiritual ancestry of the Jewish people.

HERBERT THORNDIKE.

In this day of ecclesiastical rapprochement in which we breathe the air of Lausanne and Lambeth and witness the moving spectacle of two great Presbyterian denominations merging into one, it is inevitable that the great controversies of the seventeenth century on ecclesiastical polity should come to mind. In that distracted age and in that long dispute a place of great interest was taken by the subject of the work before us—*Herbert Thorndike, 1598–1672*, by Canon T. A. Lacey, D.D. (S.P.C.K.; 6s. net).

Not many know Thorndike even by name. Probably not many will read his works, which indeed are not easily accessible. He cannot be described as a clear writer, and for literary style he seems to have had something like contempt. He read voraciously, perhaps he had done better in writing had he read rather less. He sees little with sufficient clearness because he sees too many things at once. So he needs a wise and understanding interpreter, and he has found one in Canon Lacey.

Canon Lacey's book is delightful to read. He—perforce as he explains—took a long time to write it, and the time has not been wasted. The work is valuable in our opinion not chiefly for its exposition of Thorndike, but as one of the fairest, most helpful histories we have read of the Anglican Church in the days of Cromwell and the Restoration.

THE AIMS OF EDUCATION.

The theme of education is everywhere at present. Nearly all the magazines have an article on it; and books pour from the press to establish one or other point of view. We hardly know where we are in this field, and in this bewilderment we are glad of any gleam of light that shows a path. *The Aims of Education and other Essays*, by A. N. Whitehead, LL.D., Sc.D., F.R.S., Professor of Philosophy in Harvard University, and Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge (Williams & Norgate; 7s. 6d.), will do something to guide us in the maze, if only to show us where not to go. The main object of these able essays is to warn us that mere knowledge is a barren thing—what the writer calls 'dead knowledge.' Why, for example, do you teach equations? or mathematics at all? Often it is simply a barren thing, in the air, 'inert ideas.' You must teach the subject in connexion with *things*, and show that it is actual. 'The pupils have got to be made to feel that they are studying something, and are not merely executing intellectual minuets.' The writer protests not only against dead knowledge, but against the idea that there is one course of study which gives general culture, and another which gives special knowledge. The two must always be joined, or there is no real education. 'You may not divide the seamless coat of learning.' And over and over the author impresses on us that the aim of education is not facts, but wisdom; not knowledge, but chiefly appreciation with knowledge inset. All this is expounded in a series of brilliant chapters, full of suggestion, humour, and conviction. The book has a lot of dynamite lying about in it, and if the writer succeeds in blowing sky-high what he regards as fatal obstacles to education he will be content.

A brief conspectus and criticism of Premillennialism is offered by Professor George Ricker Berry, Ph.D., D.D., in a small book published in America, by the University of Chicago Press, and in this country by the Cambridge University Press. The book is entitled *Premillennialism and Old Testament Prediction*, and much of it consists of quotations from the works of prominent representatives of the doctrine criticised. Professor Berry has no difficulty in showing how little such a doctrine can appeal to a mind trained in the modern view of prophecy. Its Judaistic, material, and often positively unchristian quality, with its deliberate appropriation of the imprecatory psalms and its occasional emphasis upon the restoration of the bloody sacrifices, rests upon the assumption that the whole Bible is infallible and that the chief element in prophecy is prediction. Some aspects of the doctrine repel us by their cruelty, as when we are told that 'it is an absolute crime to go out and deceive people with the talk about peace, to tell them that nation will not war against nation'; others repel us by their grotesqueness, as when we are told that 'during the millennium Jesus and the Church will be in heaven but they will also be reigning over the earth'—that is, they will be in two places at the same time—and the difficulty is got over by the supposition that 'Mount Zion will be so elevated that it will form a connection between earth and heaven'! It is distinctly worth while to have a doctrine, the literature of which can hardly be said to be familiar to the average religious person, presented and criticised by a scholar like Professor Berry; but it does seem a pity that a small book of thirty-seven pages, with less than two hundred and fifty words to the page, should cost 6s. 9d. net in this country. We are anxious to keep in touch with the theological discussions of our American friends, but such a price for so small a book goes a long way towards making the fulfilment of so laudable an ambition impossible.

A very refreshing book has been written by Dr. J. H. B. Masterman, the Bishop of Plymouth, on *The Christianity of To-morrow* (Cassell; 7s. 6d. net). It is a review of the present situation, religious, ecclesiastical, and theological. The writer has a broad mind, and is able to do what seems impossible for some people, to see the big things big and the little things little. He has also a facile pen and a pleasant style which make the book easy to read. The themes he deals with are the large religious realities, the Person of Christ, the Fatherhood of God, the Social Gospel (this is specially good), the Reunion of the Churches, and the Bible of To-morrow. The chapter on the Old Testament is one of the best statements on the value of the Old Testament in the light of criticism that we have seen for long. Here and there we find assertions which are a little difficult to accept. 'There is no justification for the claim that every Christian layman is a priest—there is no "priesthood of the laity" as such' is one. 'The statement in the preface of the Anglican Ordinal, that "from the Apostles' time there have been these orders of ministers in Christ's Church: Bishops, Priests and Deacons," may be accepted as substantially true,' is another. But such doubtful deliverances are rare, and one can say of the book as a whole that it is not only interesting and helpful, but an extremely valuable contribution to the reconciliation of the average man's 'modern mind' with the religion of Jesus Christ.

The Christian World Pulpit for the half-year from January till the end of June contains abundant proof from cover to cover of the all-round excellence of preaching in all our Protestant religious denominations. 'Ecce Homo! This is what the

Church keeps saying all the way around the world.' In the volume are addresses by archbishops, bishops, deans, canons of the Anglican Church, principals and professors of theological colleges, and leading ministers of all denominations. There is no phase of the religious thought and activity at the present time that is not frankly and faithfully dealt with in many of these addresses and sermons on special occasions (The Christian World Ltd.; 7s. 6d. net). A sermon, in abridged form, will be found in 'The Christian Year.'

It is impossible to read the biographical study of *Eugene Stock* which Miss Georgina A. Gollock has written at the request of the Church Missionary Society (3s. 6d. net) without heartily endorsing the opinion of the Bishop of Bradford that here was 'a grand old man, a great Christian and a missionary statesman of very high order.' Born, reared, and educated in London, Mr. Eugene Stock as a layman became the Secretary of the Church Missionary Society in 1881, an office which he filled with the greatest zeal and distinction till 1906, when failing health compelled him to seek relief from the responsibilities and arduous labour of that position. He was to signalize the remaining years of a life prolonged to its ninety-second year by writing a marvellously comprehensive and interesting history of the first century of the Society's manifold labours throughout the world. He had the pen of a ready writer, and although not so gifted as a preacher or speaker, yet he was so thoroughly at home with his subject that he was everywhere welcomed in pulpit or platform or conference as one who spoke with special authority. We are told that Dr. Stock, as he became in his later years, would not have found the Church Missionary Society congenial if in it his wider fellowship had been curtailed. He gave his active adhesion to the rule of the Society that 'a friendly intercourse shall be maintained with other Protestant Societies engaged in the same benevolent design of propagating the Gospel of Jesus Christ.' Despite the length of years on which he could look back he had always an open mind to such an organization as the Student Christian Movement, and could cherish the ardent hope that the best was yet to be.

A convincing defence of the Protestant standpoint was long overdue. The Roman Church has been engaging in a persistent propaganda for some years, and it is time, and more than time, for the other side to have an innings. This task has been undertaken, and brilliantly carried through, in *The Protestant Faith and Challenge*, by the Rev. R. Pyke (Epworth Press; 3s. 6d. net). The book came out of a series of week-night lectures which the writer gave on 'Protestantism.' He was surprised at the interest excited, and at the numbers who attended. We venture to predict a similar interest and reception for the lectures in their published form. The line of argument is a natural one. It begins with a study of the Church of the New Testament, and proceeds to trace the changes that took place in the course of years, the intrusion of the priest, the emergence of the Pope, and the hardening of the Church into an institution with vast power. Then comes a study of the Reformation, followed by a section on the great principles of the Protestant faith—justification by faith, the liberty of the soul, the priesthood of all believers. One thing must be said of all the writer's work. It is thoroughly candid. He never 'presses.' The Scripture passages are carefully and honestly expounded, and this may be said specially of the great passage about Peter and the rock. On the whole, this book may be commended as a fair, able, and persuasive statement of the Protestant faith, not as a sectional or negative thing, but as a reflection of New Testament Christianity.

If it be true, as the 'British Medical Journal' has asserted, that there is no tissue of the body wholly removed from the influence of spirit, then the healing art as commonly practised by the medical profession seems to stand in need of some revision. *Psychology in Service of the Soul*, by the Rev. Leslie D. Weatherhead, M.A. (Epworth Press; 3s. 6d. net), indicates lines along which certain cases may be treated with beneficent results. The writer, a trained psychologist, maintains that among cases of psychic disorder giving rise to physical symptoms there are many which are the result of spiritual disharmony, in plain words of sin. These may best be treated by the experienced pastor of souls rather than the medical practitioner, but the former ought to be more fully equipped than he usually is with a knowledge of the principles of psycho-therapy. Mr. Weatherhead's treatment of the subject is very sane and competent, but the judicious reader will not fail to reflect that psycho-analysis is a perilous path beset with pitfalls, and that its methods might have disastrous effects in the hands of an unskilled and tactless minister.

It is difficult to believe that the sermon with the title 'The Divine Pathfinder,' which is given in 'The Christian Year' this month, was written by a man of eighty-seven. But it has been taken, though in considerably shortened form, from a collection of sermons by the late Dr. W. L. Watkinson which has just been published by the Epworth Press (3s. 6d. net). The title of the volume is *The Stability of the Spiritual*. It contains nine sermons, and all of these, full of thought and expressed in well-chosen language, were written in the last year of Dr. Watkinson's life. The sermons are prefaced by an appreciation by Mr. G. Beesley Austin. No suggestion is made that a longer biography is in preparation, and so it behoves all Dr. Watkinson's friends—and they were many—to get this volume. Dr. Watkinson's early circumstances made scholarship, in the strict sense of the word, impossible for him. But his natural gifts were of so high a quality that he overcame all early disadvantages and became a preacher of outstanding power and distinction. He entered the ministry in 1858, was elected to the Legal Hundred in 1883, became Fernley Lecturer in 1886. In 1893 he became Connexional Editor, a post which he held until 1904. When the Wesleyan Conference was held in Leeds in 1897 he was president. But Mr. Austin's short account of Dr. Watkinson does not do more than outline the events of his life. The space is used to the best advantage with an account of Dr. Watkinson's mental and spiritual development from the time when 'the homage of a lad's soul' went out 'to the fairest and the highest he had seen.' Four graces in especial he had—a rare simplicity, a gift of appreciation, and a gift of praise, and, in addition, Mr. Austin says, he was 'the humblest man I have ever met.'

Mr. H. W. B. Joseph, M.A., has published *A Comparison of Kant's Idealism with that of Berkeley* (Milford; 1s. 6d. net), being the Annual Philosophical Lecture under the Henriette Hertz Trust read before the British Academy on July 3, 1929. It seems to the author that there are some points of interest in the relation of Berkeley's thought to Kant's which he has not found worked out. With reference to the question of the existence of a world of bodies in space independent of mind, which both Berkeley and Kant deny, 'Kant, it may be said, asks of mind in us more than, on his theory, it could achieve; Berkeley, in a sense, asks too little.'

The Rev. F. H. Wales, B.D.(Oxon.), whose translation of the first Book of the Psalter we had occasion to commend some time ago, has followed it up by a *Translation of the Psalms—Book II.* (Milford; 1s. net), which maintains the high standard of excellence set by the former translation. There is the same regard for the literary form of the Psalter, and the same intimate acquaintance with the criticism of the text. As an illustration of the latter take 49[7], 'surely none can at all ransom himself' (not 'his brother'), while the former is illustrated by the careful attention paid to refrains, for example, in Pss 42 f., 46, 49, 56 f., 59, 62, 67. There is real scholarship in this little book, which quite unobtrusively keeps the lay reader abreast of modern criticism and leaves him with a translation more accurate and scarcely less appealing than those of the familiar English version.

The George Dana Boardman lectureship on Christian Ethics has produced a considerable number of volumes by writers distinguished and not so distinguished. James Moffatt, Francis G. Peabody, Charles Foster Kent, and Lyman Abbott have contributed. The last five lectures, by different hands, have all been printed together in one volume with the title *Christian Ethics* (published in this country by the Oxford University Press; 6s. 6d. net). The subjects are 'Christian Ethics in Everyday Life,' by Frederick R. Griffin; 'Ethics in Education,' by Edwin C. Broome; 'The Christian Home,' by W. P. McNally; 'The Originality of Christian Ethics,' by George C. Foley; and 'The Two Roads,' by Boyd Edwards. They are all good, solid, and satisfying discussions of familiar topics. There is no startling originality about any of them. But the ground is well covered, and the reader will find the treatment helpful and stimulating.

The Rev. Canon A. R. Whitham, M.A., Principal of Culham College, seeks to provide in *St. Paul* (Rivingtons; 12s. 6d. net) a connected view of the Apostle's life and letters, which may serve as a simple and popular introduction to a closer and deeper study of the Acts and the Epistles. He has been successful in his aim, and the usefulness of his book is enhanced by its clear and straightforward style. It will be found a particularly useful book by teachers of divinity in schools and training colleges. It should be observed that while Canon Whitham adopts a conservative standpoint on questions of authenticity and genuineness, he is familiar with other standpoints. The book contains four maps.

In that excellent series 'Translations of Christian Literature' there now appears *Saint Bernard: The Twelve Degrees of Humility and Pride*, by Mr. B. R. V. Mills, M.A. (S.P.C.K.; 6s. net). The 'Introduction' by Mr. Mills and his excursus on Cistercian monastic life are very illuminating; and St. Bernard's little work here adequately made available for the ordinary reader repays study.

The Great Church Union in Scotland.

By Professor H. R. Mackintosh, D.Phil., D.D., Edinburgh.

On the second day of October 1929 there will take place, *Deo volente*, what it is not unfitting to call the greatest event in the ecclesiastical history of Scotland since the Reformation. There will then be consummated an incorporating Union of the two Presbyterian Churches of national dimensions. They are the Church of Scotland and the United Free Church of Scotland. Neither, in becoming one with the other, will part with its identity, and the designation of the reunited whole will be 'The Church of Scotland.'

For centuries, Scotland has been a land of Church divisions and reunions. The Secession Church and the Relief Church, both dating from the eighteenth century, came together in 1847, to form the United Presbyterian Church; in 1867 the Reformed Presbyterian Church merged in the Free Church of Scotland; in 1900 the United Presbyterian Church combined with the Free Church to form the United Free Church, one of the two Churches covering the whole country, which are now to become one. These are only the largest of the unions in the past. And it is to be noted that even when breaking off originally from the Establishment, for reasons of conscience, none of the separating Churches would for a moment have owned that it was forfeiting its share in 'The Church of Scotland.' A difference of conviction had emerged, only for a time, as was hoped, with regard to the right relations of Church and State; but there was no divergence of doctrine. The question how State and Church are to be adjusted to each other has been the one great controversy which led to Scottish ecclesiastical divisions, and it is because this question has for all immediate purposes been solved—so far as any vast human problem admits of solution—that the great Union of to-day is possible.

Union has always been the declared policy of both Churches. To the Church of Scotland, formerly, union was conceivable only on the basis of Establishment, in the main as then existing; to a large majority of the United Free Church, as of the Churches from which it sprang, union appeared something that could be achieved solely by Disestablishment, such as had occurred in Ireland. But in the present century various motives began to alter the temper on both sides. The purely religious desire for Christian Unity awoke and spread widely. It was felt that the first step for Scottish Christians holding the Presbyterian order was to get *themselves* united. Keen observers of life called attention loudly to the fact that the distribution of religious forces no longer corresponded to the distribution of the people; new districts too often were nearly churchless; and something like a quarter of the whole population of the country was adrift from Christian fellowship. The sense of these evils was sharpened by a new feeling of shame over the Church's waste of its actual resources. Visitors to a country village could find, distressingly often, that three or even four different Presbyterian bodies faced each other across its streets or lanes, no one of them strong enough to provide an inspiring common life or to tackle urgent social tasks. The scandal of what seemed too like rivalry for rivalry's sake became intolerable. In addition to this, to some extent as its consequence, the Churches had to face a shortage of clergy. For some years it has been increasingly difficult for vacant congregations in the outlying parts of Scotland to secure ministers. 'In our combined Presbyteries, numbering twenty-seven charges,' said a representative of an island group the other day, 'thirteen charges are without a pastor.'

In spite of old divisions, it was less difficult than might have been supposed to kindle the beacon of Church Union and gather men around it in eager masses. Let it be remembered that in Scotland the contrast of Church and Dissent has counted for little. Those who loved to 'unchurch' their neighbours, if only it could be done with a show of religious earnestness, were few. The members of different communions intermarried freely. Even those who lived outside it were aware that the Church of Scotland has often been violently opposed to Erastianism, and on occasion well knew how to keep the State in its proper place. And spectators of the United Free Church could see that it, not less than its neighbour, held the ideal of a Church which should bring the blessings of the Christian gospel to every door in the land. Thus, once the movement towards union had begun, the forces that must increase its speed and weight were powerful.

Nothing more can be attempted here than the briefest historical sketch of the negotiations which have led to the present position, with its incalculable potencies for good. In 1908, after pioneer work by Dr. Mair, and under the influence of Dr. Archibald Scott, of St. George's, Edinburgh, the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland proposed to the United Free Church that the two communions should join hands in religious co-operation throughout the country, and was answered that not co-operation but union was the best thing to consider. Thereupon the Church of Scotland, taking its courage in its hands, with a public spirit which cannot be overpraised, definitely accepted this proposal for 'unrestricted conference'—that is to say, such conference about the impediments to union as should not presuppose that the rights and wrongs of 'establishment' were a forbidden topic. This proposal was accepted, and in 1909 negotiations began. The 'will to unite' was at last present.

For some years progress was slow and doubtful. Both sides stood more or less on the defensive; each was anxious to state its own case, to expose weak points in the other's armour, to give nothing away. There was a good deal of able but rather barren dialectic, which perhaps did no great harm but led nowhere. Members of the 'Two Hundreds,' as the conferring committees were popularly styled, could tell of days when the utmost pessimism prevailed and men began to ask, half in despair, whether it was worth while to go on. As Dr. Alexander Whyte one morning set out for a critical meeting between the representatives of both Churches, he said to his companion sorrowfully: 'This is the end.' They seemed to be up against a blank wall, in which even the optimism of faith could perceive no door.

Then came an abrupt change. In 1912 appeared a Memorandum, the authorship of which has been widely ascribed to Lord Sands,[1] now an eminent Judge of the Court of Session, and which the best minds at once felt must clear the air and open up new possibilities of action. It suggested a fresh method of approach. Hitherto the United Free Church had felt it to be a fatal difficulty that the constitution of the Church of Scotland was prescribed for and conferred upon it by the State; and with a Church so constituted, it declared, it could not unite. The Church of Scotland with perfect sincerity refused to acknowledge that its constitution could be thus described, holding that its relation to the civil power was of quite another kind. Now came the epoch-making Memorandum. There the proposal was made that instead of endlessly debating so controversial a point, on which agreement never could be reached, the Church of Scotland should adopt another course. Let it first of all set down the constitution which it believed itself to possess by inherent right, identifying itself as in creed a branch of the Holy Catholic Church, stating its adhesion to the fundamental principle of national religion and not less its full spiritual independence as a Church of Christ; and, with this self-expressed constitution in its hand, let it next approach the State through Parliament, and request that this constitution should be not conferred but *acknowledged*. What both sides held the State cannot give, since it has no authority in spiritual matters, the State none the less may recognize as existing. It may take cognizance of that which it cannot bestow.

It was resolved to pursue this path. The Church of Scotland was, of course, entirely willing that the State should admit publicly its possession of intrinsic powers it had been accustomed to claim for itself, and the United Free Church was quick to mark the difference between a State-imparted and a State-acknowledged constitution. Things do not change in character by their character being confessed; and if a Church is convinced of its own freedom, it is not the less free because the State admits the fact. Manifestly the new road was full of promise. Accordingly, with care and gravity, the Church of Scotland set itself to the task of thinking out afresh, and formulating in unambiguous terms, the constitution by which it meant to live. In the main the task was not difficult, but it demanded the utmost care, and it took time. The work had not proceeded far when in 1914 the tragedy of war overwhelmed the world.

[1] It certainly owes most to his courageous wisdom.

The influence of the Great War upon negotiation between the Churches was almost paradoxical in character. On the one hand, in the tumult and perplexity of the time, the business of Union had perforce to be almost completely suspended. More urgent affairs absorbed the mind. On the other hand, the anxieties and labours of war-time drew men and Churches more closely together than had been the case within human memory. Thus, while conference for the moment ceased, the ministers and members of the two communions entered into a more warm and intimate fellowship, sharing each other's sorrows, tasting of the same consolations, helping each other out in similar fields of duty. In scores of parishes, during the absence of one minister in France or Gallipoli, his colleague of the other Church took over the whole work, and the congregations worshipped together for months at a time. It was not merely that they prayed under the same roof; they came to know each other; and ignorance of what the other side is thinking and feeling has been one great reason why divisions in the Christian Church have persisted. We misinterpret what is seldom or never before our eyes.

At last the War ended, and in an atmosphere hallowed by the universal memory of sacrifice and valour the Union conferences were resumed. All along the Church of Scotland had been at work on the domestic task of framing its constitution, and in 1919 the final draft of the Articles[1] in which that constitution is set forth was made public. Nine in number, the Articles affirmed the essential adherence of the Church of Scotland to Trinitarian and Evangelical Protestantism, and in unequivocal words asserted its right to do such vital things as formulate its own subordinate standards of doctrine, constitute its own courts, and add to the Articles themselves. The document is an impressive one, and has frequently been described as affording a better statement of the spiritual principles for which the United Free Church stood than that Church itself had ever succeeded in giving.

Thus equipped, the Church of Scotland next addressed itself to Parliament. Suffice it to state that as a result there was passed in 1921 an Act the importance of which cannot possibly be rated too high. This measure did not *enact* the Articles—this was done in 1926 by the Church of Scotland—but it removed the legal obstacles to that Church adopting those Articles as its constitution. It did more. Not only was the constitution of the Church of Scotland thus made explicit, but there was on the part of the State a new recognition of the Church's right to exercise powers which previously it could not have exercised without the consent of Parliament. The Act of 1921 was, indeed, a great event in the history of jurisprudence. For the first time the State now acknowledged the Church in its full and proper character *as a Church*, that is to say, as a spiritual reality possessed of inherent powers of self-government and self-development. Not the least satisfactory feature of the Act was its express declaration that nothing in its provisions was to prejudice the position of other Churches. It was a worthy issue of centuries of argument, sacrifice, and faith. Now, at last, was abolished what had been the chief source of all the cleavages in the ancient Church of Scotland—the unwarrantable interference of the State in the Church's spiritual affairs. It was now possible to see the Church in 'the right relations to the State'; in relations, to express it otherwise, of recognized freedom and autonomy which could also be entered into and enjoyed by other Churches at their will.

There still remained a second obstacle to union. The United Free Church had from the first explained that union was possible for it only on the condition that the one Church was in as full and untrammelled possession of its property as the other. This brought up the question of the *teinds* (roughly equivalent to the English *tithes*). For long a keen debate had been in progress on the question whether the teinds were public property or represented the gifts of pious donors long ago, so as to form in strictness 'the patrimony of the Church.' The debate had led to no clear result, and few sensible men believed it would ever lead to any. In that case, why should not the matter be laid before Parliament for a decision which should be final? The Church of Scotland resolved upon this step. Accordingly, at its instance a Parliamentary Committee was set up, presided over by Lord Haldane, and charged with the duty of reporting upon the civil endowments of the Church. The outcome was an Act, passed in 1925, which brought the present system to an end, and vested the Church of Scotland in these ancient endowments as its own legally unchallengeable property, to be used ever after for the religious good of Scotland. The endowments, unfortunately, were not converted into or commuted for a capital sum, as had been done more or less in Ireland and Wales, as Lord Haldane's Committee had recommended, and as the Church of Scotland itself had strongly desired. For financial reasons this was found to be impracticable. But the land-charge which still remains is wholly different from the teinds. It can be redeemed at any time; it can be bought and sold like a feu-duty; and, in addition and most important, it is subject to the central free control of the Church and only in part tied up with a particular parish, and even there not with any single congregation.[1]

---

[1] The first draft appeared in 1914.

These Acts having been placed on the statute-book, thus removing the main causes which had kept the Churches apart, the two Churches were free to take up the task of negotiating the actual terms of union. This has occupied the last three or four years. The upshot of ceaseless discussion and statesman-like adjustment may be seen mainly in two documents of fundamental importance for the new united Church. These are the 'Basis of Union' and the 'Plan of Union.' Broadly, but not inaccurately, it may be said that the 'Basis' deals with matters of constitution, the 'Plan' with administration. As it lies before us, the 'Basis' contains the vital constitutional documents of both Churches, *e.g.* the Act of Union (sometimes called 'the Uniting Act'), the Articles of the Church of Scotland as described above, the United Free Church Act anent Spiritual Independence dating from 1906 (this was passed after the famous House of Lord's decision of 1904, and gave fresh and unambiguous expression to the Church's claim to autonomy as well as its right to develop its own constitution), the Declaratory Acts of 1879 and 1892 regarding the Westminster Confession of Faith, and the Questions and Formula to be used at the ordination of ministers in the united Church. Provision is also made in the 'Plan of Union' for the establishment of a central fund for the Maintenance of a Gospel Ministry from end to end of Scotland. As might be expected, the 'Basis and Plan' are coloured throughout by the two profound spiritual principles for which the Churches have worked and suffered—the national recognition of religion, or the doctrine that nations as such, and not individuals only, owe obedience to Christ; and the spiritual freedom of the Church, or the doctrine that the civil power has no jurisdiction in her spiritual affairs. In future years, it is certain, these two great convictions, in defence of which not much ink merely but blood has been spilt, will continue to inspire and guide the re-united Church of Scotland.

One problem of no little significance which has had to be tackled within these last years, as a rider to the general settlement, is the relation of the Church's Theological Colleges to the national Universities. Hitherto the Church of Scotland, without setting up separate Divinity Colleges of her own, has utilized the Theological Chairs in the Universities for the training of her students. She did not appoint the professors, though they must be members of her communion, and her power to remove them, for any grave fault of life or doctrine, was questioned. In the United Free Church the professors of theology are appointed, controlled, and salaried by the Church itself. Two such systems, it is obvious, cannot simply be amalgamated, and a revision of methods is indispensable. But wisdom and goodwill have not been lacking, and three general principles which should govern any re-arrangement have been agreed to. 'The *first* is that the existing University Theological Chairs, while they should be freed from the statutory (theological) tests now imposed upon the holders of such Chairs, should be continued in some form of which they would still be serviceable for the instruction of the students of the Church. The *second* is that the relations between the Theological Colleges and the Universities should be as close as possible. The *third* is that the Church must retain effective control over those to whom the doctrinal instruction of its Ministry is to be intrusted.' In harmony with these conditions, it is now proposed that future appointments to the existing University Theological Chairs (possibly with some modification in the subjects assigned them) should be made by an Electoral Board equally representative of the Church or Churches and the University. Further, the professors of the United Free Church Colleges holding office at the date of Union are to become professors in one of the University Faculties of Theology, the Church guaranteeing payment of their salaries; and on the same terms their successors will be appointed by the Church. As teachers of the Church will thus acquire the status of University Professors, so students preparing for the ministry will be matriculated students of the University. This general scheme, though it has gained the substantial assent of Churches and Universities, cannot be put in force until there has been obtained the legislation necessary to abolish tests, the relinquishment by present patrons of their rights of patronage, and the approval by the Universities' Committee of the Privy Council of the conditions of tenure attached to the new Chairs. But the framework of the scheme is fixed. It is a vital element in its value that it implies no monopoly for the Church of Scotland in the new Theological Faculties of the Universities. Powers, for example, are to be taken to admit of other Churches being represented on the Appointments Board.

---

[1] Over this transaction the Church of Scotland lost about one-sixth of the whole annual revenue from teinds, but in return gained an unfettered control of her entire property.

As we look back and summarize our impressions of these great changes, we are entitled to say that the Christian communion about to be formed will rightly bear the name of 'the Church of Scotland'—national and free. It will be, in the language of the Articles, 'representative of the Christian Faith of the Scottish people.' With respect to her possession of the intrinsic freedom without which no Christian Church is equal to its idea, no doubt can exist in any unprejudiced mind. The language of the Articles is unambiguous. 'This Church,' we read in Article V., 'has the inherent right, free from interference by civil authority, but under the safeguards for deliberate action and legislation provided by the Church itself, to frame or adopt its subordinate standards, to declare the sense in which it understands its Confession of Faith, to modify the forms of expression therein, or to formulate other doctrinal statements, and to define the relation thereto of its office-bearers and members, but always in agreement with the Word of God and the fundamental doctrines of the Christian Faith contained in the said Confession, *of which agreement the Church shall be sole judge*,[1] and with due regard to liberty of opinion in points which do not enter into the substance of the Faith.' Could anything be more lucid, straightforward, or sufficient? The united Church will be free, as soon as it may judge it wise, to draw up a simpler statement of its Faith, and put it in place of the Westminster Confession. But the new doctrinal statement, as Article I. makes equally clear, must be Trinitarian, Evangelical, and Protestant in character. It must not be, for example, Unitarian or Romanist. And if it be replied that Article I. binds the Church to an outworn doctrine of the Trinity by its use of the term 'substance,' in the phrase concerning the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost which runs, 'the same in substance, equal in power and glory,' the question may well be asked in rejoinder, why the term 'substance' should alone of all ancient theological words, be incapable of re-interpretation. If 'substance' at one time did imply what was less or lower than personal or spiritual, it may now be read in a higher sense. It may be read in the light of the conviction, taught us by Christ Himself, that the 'essence' of Godhead is Holy Love.

The hope had been cherished that the United Free Church, like the Church of Scotland, might pass into the Union with unbroken ranks, leaving not a man behind. But this hope, apparently, is not to be fulfilled. As there have been conscientious objectors at other points of history, so now there remains a Minority, of uncertain and dwindling size, the members of which insist on the abandonment of all aid from funds derived 'from public sources,' as well as on freedom to alter Article I. in the Church of Scotland's new constitution. The first of these conditions offends against the sense of justice, for it has not been the habit of this country to deprive people thus peremptorily of property they have held for centuries, nor is it in harmony with the feeling, prevalent in the United Free Church from the outset, that the question of endowments was a domestic affair to be settled, as in fact it has been settled, between the Church of Scotland and Parliament. As regards freedom to change Article I., it has always proved impossible to discover in what sense the Minority desire to be free from the doctrinal particulars actually stated in the Article, interpreted by the free judgment of the Church, not to speak of the fact that the United Free Church is itself bound by precisely the same doctrine. It hardly appears as if the position of the Minority would enable them to address a call, vivid and compelling, to the best religious mind of Scotland.

The Union of the Churches will not of itself, it may be freely granted, bring in the Kingdom of God in Scotland. But the failure of this effort to bring Christians together would have struck a dire blow at the religious prospects of the country. It would have led many to turn from organized Christianity with a natural resentment. Union, we cannot too often remind ourselves, is an act of faith and duty. 'One step enough for me' is a motto which has served well in the past, and still serves. No Church can be free except as it dares to be free, and puts its freedom constantly in operation. At this hour prayer is going up from unnumbered devout hearts that the experience of Union may enkindle our love to Christ, inflame our zeal, and enable us so to discern the will of God, and so faithfully to perform it, that His name may be glorified, and His Church built up in faith and hope.

---

[1] Italics mine. The phrase recurs in the Preamble to the Questions for Ordination.

The Pastorals and a Second Trial of Paul.

By the Reverend F. R. Montgomery Hitchcock, D.D., Maldon.

It was Paul's plan to visit Spain after Rome. Of his intention to visit Rome we hear frequently (Ro $1^{11.\,13}$ 15^{23}, Ac 19^{21}; cf. 2 Co 10^{16}). But he did not intend to stay. He would not build upon another's foundation (Ro 15^{20}), a sentiment that would be appreciated by Romans whose Romulus legend was connected with another's *foundation*. In 2 Co 10^{16}, referring to the same purpose to preach the gospel in 'the parts beyond,' which would include Rome and Spain, he used a different term—'line' (κανών). His resolution is fixed, but the time is not yet. 'Whensoever (ὡς ἄν) I proceed to Spain' (Ro 15^{24}). 'For I hope on my passage through to see you and to have a send-off from you on my journey there.' Here he used a word (διαπορευόμενος) which Polybius had used (iii. 68) of the legions that passed through Rome on their march to meet Hannibal. He also alludes to the Roman custom of escorting distinguished persons to their offices (προπεμφθῆναι). This term also conveys the temporary nature of his visit, and that his sphere of action lies beyond Rome. He is now proceeding with his collection (εὐλογία, 2 Co 9^{5}) to Jerusalem; and lest they should be jealous, he adds, 'I shall make my way back through you to Spain, and am sure I shall come to you with a full blessing (εὐλογία) of Christ.' In Ac 19^{21}, 'After I have been there (J) I must also see Rome,' he said nothing about this projected visit to Spain, not wishing to make the Ephesians jealous. They would have been more jealous of the visit to Spain than the Romans, the eastern markets being in keen competition with the western, which the Romans naturally favoured as Romanized. This may be the reason why nothing is recorded of Paul's visit to the West. We have to take into account not merely the jealousy of Gentile and Jew, but also the jealousy of Roman and Greek. The feeling against Greeks was intense in the Roman world in those days and later, and in Romanized districts like Spain and Gaul, and was heartily reciprocated by the Greeks, who refused to be Romanized.

When Paul wrote Ro 15 his idea was to return and visit Spain, taking Rome on the way. So far, he says, he has in preaching 'proceeded from Jerusalem round about, even to Illyricum' (v.^{19}), meaning that he has done his duty to the eastern portion of the Empire, and would now turn to the western. The question is, would Paul, whose purpose had been delayed by two long periods of imprisonment, have carried out his plan when released? This assumes that he was released, an assumption based upon the following considerations:

(1) The Acts ends on a ringing note of optimism: 'proclaiming the kingdom of God and teaching the things concerning the Lord Jesus Christ with complete liberty and without hindrance' (μετὰ πάσης παῤῥησίας ἀκωλύτως). How easy to add a short sentence regarding His death, if it happened. There were no reasons practical or political for silence. But, if release followed, it would be a well-known fact unnecessary to mention, for the writer intended to write a third volume, Ac 1^{1}, meaning 'the first' (πρῶτον) not 'the former' treatise. So at the end of Acts we stand on the verge of something new for Paul and the Church. Luke stops, like writers of serials, at a situation pregnant with life and interest. His clear-cut period of two completed years stands out in his memory against some background so important as to need a book for itself. He knew what happened.

(2) The precise way in which he mentions this period, 'he abode two whole years (διετία ὅλη) in his own hired house' (Ac 28^{30}), implies that after those two years he did not abide in his own hired house but had moved out of it. Where? This exact period corresponds with other fixed periods in Acts, *e.g.* 'a year and six months' (18^{11}), 'two years' (19^{10}), 'two full years' (24^{27}). In all these places the aorist denotes that the period mentioned came to an end, and another began. The precise measurement of the period in question implies that something happened at the end. What? What would a Roman understand? Surely release. In the *Hecyra* of Terence (I. ii. 12) a woman says, 'I endured him for two complete years' (*biennium perpetuum*). She says nothing about release, but it is understood. As nothing is said to the contrary, we are entitled to infer a release here.

(3) What a splendid ending to Paul's story and conclusion to the Acts if Luke could have closed his records with an account of Paul's martyrdom, which would have suitably followed that of Stephen and James! Such a climax would have appealed to Luke's artistic sense, but instead he presents us

with the apostle's uncontrolled liberty of speech as his climax.

(4) What we think happened was this. When Paul was released after his trial, conditionally upon leaving Rome, Luke would have accompanied him to a port east or west of Rome, and then withdrawn to Philippi, and Paul was on his way to rejoin him in Macedonia when he begged Timothy to remain in Ephesus (1 Ti 1^{3}). This would leave time for a visit to Spain or Gaul. For it would be unlike Paul to have ceased to feel the urge to preach in those parts after his release. If he failed to carry out his purpose—and he was nothing if not tenacious of purpose, *e.g.* in the collection—how can we explain the exultant note in 2 Ti 4^{17}, 'So that through me the message might be completely given, and *all the nations* might hear,' if he failed to let the nations who collected in Rome hear? This phrase πάντα τὰ ἔθνη has here the same force that the 'race of mortals' or 'the human race' has in Tacitus, who used both expressions of the people of the empire; *e.g. Ann.* xv. 44, where speaking of the fire and the massacre he says the Christians were 'condemned owing to the hatred of the *human race* for them' (*odio humani generis*). Tacitus, a strict Roman, would certainly include the western half of the Empire, the Romanized portion, as well as the eastern. On what principle are we to exclude them from Paul's summary?

(5) Paul's optimism received no check during his imprisonment. In Ph 2^{17} he referred to his death as a remote possibility.[1] '*Even supposing* that I am offered up'—which he rejects a few lines down—'but I am confident in the Lord that I myself shall also shortly come' (v.^{24}). See also Ph 1^{26}, Col 4^{7}. And he requests Philemon to prepare him a lodging. At the end of the two years, we hear of nothing to damp his hopes. The Acts and Epistles sound the same note.

(6) In Ac 23^{11} we have our Lord's encouragement, 'Cheer up, for, *as* thou didst testify concerning me in Jerusalem, thou must, *in like manner*, testify in (unto) Rome.' The ὡς . . . οὕτως implies similarity of witness. This message meant Paul's deliverance from Jews, why not similar deliverance from Romans. His first testimony was made before a tribunal, why should not the second be also before a tribunal? This appearance of Jesus made it impossible for the narrator to ignore the gloom of the apostle on his way to the city. Such anticipations as we find in Ac $20^{22f.}$ are no indication of his future, for they were dissipated by that appearance. That message discounts the argument based upon Ac 20^{25} against the second imprisonment.

Encircled by weeping friends and weeping himself, Paul used words he probably would not have uttered an hour before. He is going to Jerusalem, not knowing what bonds and troubles await him there, and adds, '*I know that you shall no longer see my face, I mean all of you*' (οὐκέτι . . . ὑμεῖς πάντες). It is argued that this means that the Ephesians will never see him again. Supposing that the words can be so understood, why might not Paul have been mistaken? He was not infallible. Writing afterwards to Philemon and the Philippians he expressed a confident hope of release. Which of these was frustrated? One ambiguously reported by another person once, the other plainly expressed three times by himself, at a date much nearer the event. The expectation of release is surely the weightier. And the gloomy forebodings of Ac 20^{25} and 21^{23} are set aside by the cheering message of the Lord in 23^{14} and supply no basis for argument.

Moreover, the Greek words cannot bear the weight placed upon them. 'Not again you all, shall see my face' means 'Some of you shall not see my face again': cf. 2 Th 3^{2}, 'faith is not the gift of all' (οὐ πάντων), means 'it is the gift of some, not of none'; 1 Co 15^{51}, 'We shall not all sleep' does not mean 'none of us shall sleep'; cf. Ac 10^{40}, etc. The next time some would be missing. Against this one doubtful saying we have many optimistic ones, *e.g.* Ph 1^{19}, 'I know that this will turn out to my salvation,' the very words used in Job 13^{16} (LXX) to express Job's certainty of the vindication of his character. So far, we have seen nothing to make the apostle give up his project. That he changed his plans is clear from his request to Philemon to secure him a lodging. But this does not imply that his plan of visiting the West was completely dropped. Neither is there anything to suggest a fatal termination to his first imprisonment.

But taking up 2 Tim., we sense a different situation and a different mood. Paul no longer has personal liberty. His friends no longer have easy access to him in his private lodging. He is in Rome again, but in a different locality, where his friend Onesiphorus found him with great difficulty (1^{17}), and in need of comforts, loaded with a chain but without his cloak, books, and tablets which he had during his first captivity, in disgrace and prison as a *criminal* (κακοῦργος), such as a man charged with *majestas*, high treason, would be classed. What caused this change? A legal process called *endeixis*, instituted by one Alexander (iv. 14, ‘Alexander laid *information* against me of many offences’). The LXX of Gn 50^{15} has caused the error of translating ‘did me much evil.’ Luke would have put that differently, Ac 9^{13}, ἐποίησε, but here we have ἐνεδείξατο.[1] The similar action taken against Apollonius, about this time, was introduced by an *endeixis*, and his trial or defence was called *apologia*, as Paul’s is here. Apollonius, as guilty of *majestas*, was thrown among the *most criminal*; so Paul was treated as a *criminal* here. Although he has lost his cheerfulness, he shows the same philosophic spirit, ‘I am reconciled’ (σπένδομαι, Eurip. *Bacch.* 284).

---

[1] Jebb on εἰ καί, *Œdipus Tyrannus*, p. 296.

In ch. 4 vv.$^{14-17}$ imply acquittal after the first trial, re-arrest, and a second trial. The apostle is in a reminiscent mood all through the second Epistle, and relates certain details of the first trial which must have been known to Timothy in order to dispel his fears regarding the second. It is surely natural that in his second captivity he should recall the former. In our letters we are not always giving news. We often comment upon incidents well known to both parties. It is remarkable that we can set out in corresponding columns the accounts of the two trials Paul has stood:

1. ‘In my first trial no man stood with me[1] (as witness), but all forsook me. May it not be laid to their account. But the Lord stood beside me[2] (as advocate) and strengthened me, and I was delivered out of the mouth of the lion, that through me the gospel might be fully proclaimed, and all the nations might hear’ (vv.$^{16.\ 17}$) [this implies a complete deliverance, not a preliminary *actio* which would leave Paul within the lion’s reach].

2. ‘Demas forsook me. Only Luke is with me. Alexander the coppersmith laid many criminal charges against me. The Lord shall reward him according to his works. (Of whom do thou beware also, for he greatly withstood our words.) But the Lord shall deliver me from every evil work, and bring me safely into his heavenly kingdom’ (vv.$^{9.\ 11.\ 14.\ 15.\ 18}$).

Vv.$^{16.\ 17}$ are just another of Paul’s many digressions. The present situation recalls the previous. Then the Lord befriended him in his isolation; now He will do the same. Alexander has recently opposed *our* arguments (as Paul never used ‘our’ of himself, this implies Luke’s advocacy), but ever since the first trial all the nations have listened. Then the Lord delivered him out of the mouth of the lion, Nero, in order that he might bring the gospel to the whole Roman Empire, western as well as eastern. Now He will deliver him from every evil work of Alexander and bring him into his eternal kingdom. The passage is not only a digression, it contains an hyperbaton, or verbal misplacement, which Irenæus pointed out as a peculiarity of Paul in 2 Th 2^{8}, etc. See also 1 Ti 1^{3}, ‘As I requested you, remain (προσμεῖναι[3]) in Ephesus, when I was proceeding to Macedonia’ (not ellipse).

The words, ‘I was delivered out of the mouth of the lion’ (ἐρύσθην, v.^{17}), have been attracted from their proper place, after the ‘Lord gave me power,’ to the following phrase, ‘he shall deliver (ῥύσεται) me,’ both terms being used together in 2 Co 1^{10}, ‘he delivered us, and shall deliver.’ The verb ‘give power’ is not followed by ‘in order that’ in the N.T., but ‘deliver’ is. That the words ‘the Lord shall deliver me from every evil work’ belong to the Alexander passage which refers to the second trial is clear from the exact *parallelismus*, even clearer in the Greek: ‘The Lord will reward him according to his works’; ‘The Lord will deliver me from every evil work.’ This study in contrasts belongs to the Alexander passage. There are many discordant notes in the last page of the Pastorals which may be resolved by the explanation of a second trial. The preliminary character of the second trial is required to explain other points (we have such preliminary trials in the *Life* of Apollonius by Philostratus, who calls them προαγών), for Paul has not yet received his sentence. But he knew it would not be long delayed. So he asked Timothy twice at the end of this letter, which had been written some time, but to which he added a postscript—the first place Timothy would study for instructions—adding some news and comments and urging him to ‘hurry’—‘hurry before the winter.’ There must have been something said at the preliminary examination to convince him that the final trial, when the sentence would be given, would take place before that winter. He may also have required his books and tablets for the last stage of his second trial. There would then be a gap of four years between the acquittal in 2 Ti 4^{17}, ‘I was delivered from the mouth of the lion,’ and the hour of his dictating the words, ‘the Lord shall deliver me from every evil work,’ an hour when Paul could truly say, 'my life-work has been accomplished. The gospel has been fully and widely preached, and *all* the nations, that is the western as well as the eastern portions of the Roman Empire, have heard.'

---

[1] Pollux, viii. 49, ὁ ἐνδεικνύμενος πρὸς τὸν ἄρχοντα τὴν ἔνδειξιν ἀποφέρει.

[2] παρεγένετο of witnesses, παρέστη of advocate. See Æschylus, *Eumenides*, 367 and 65; cf. *adsum* and *adsto*.

[3] Infin. for imper.; cf. Ph 3^{16}, στοιχεῖν.

Many other features in the Pastorals fall into line with this suggestion. Alexander's fierce 'hostility to *our* arguments' implies that on this occasion Paul had a companion, evidently Luke—'only Luke is with me'—to assist him. It is clear, then, that his opposition was shown to the pleadings of Paul and the evidence of Luke at the second trial. There would be no point in referring to such hostility at the first apologia, when Paul was without Luke's help and when the apostle was tried concerning specific charges entered on the *elogium* or charge sheet; and upon which no fresh charge could be entered. Alexander's appearance on the scene shows that it was a different trial. It was through his information that Paul had been arrested and brought a second time before the Emperor's court. His activities were still to be feared. He could still do Timothy harm if he was not careful. It was probably because Timothy had not exercised discretion regarding him that Paul was in his present trouble and had to say, 'of him do thou also beware' (v.[15]). Something had been done that had made Alexander intensely angry. We find in the first Epistle (1[20]) mention of 'Hymenæus and Alexander, whom I am handing over to Satan,[1] that they may be taught not to blaspheme.' Some tactless use of that remark by Timothy, who was inclined to scold (1 Ti 5[1]), brought this trouble upon the apostle. That that Alexander is the man in the text is quite probable. In the former passage there was no need to mention his trade as he is coupled with Hymenæus, a well-known leader of the opposition mentioned in both Epistles (1 Ti 1[20], 2 Ti 2[17]). But in the second passage his trade is specified to prevent confusion with another innocent Alexander. We have a parallel case in Ac 10[17] and 10[33]. In the first passage we have 'the house of Simon,' in the second 'the house of Simon the tanner.' Alexander's opportunity came, for just before the words which provoked him was a passage which could be construed as a personal attack upon the Emperor (1 Ti 1[8-10]), containing among many other opprobrious epithets which fitted Nero like a glove the one word that above all names he detested—*matricide*—only here in the Bible. This was Nero's 'constant epithet.' For using that word he punished people severely, and afterwards was to visit Delphi with his fury because of the oracle's reference to his crime. Now if Apollonius was impeached for high treason and impiety against Nero for saying 'pardon the gods for taking pleasure in buffoons'[2]—a reference to Nero—how much more likely would Paul (if he was informed against, and in those days Tacitus and Philostratus assure us there was not even liberty to converse or correspond) be charged with that offence. In days when 'no house could keep a secret,' when Apollonius dreaded to put his thoughts on paper, when a man's face was watched as well as his mouth, the apostle was courting death when he wrote that passage about the law not being made for a righteous man (like him), *but for unrighteous men* (like Nero) who had broken every law in the Roman calendar and claimed as Emperor to be above the Law (*lege solutus*), expressly mentioning the crime of *matricide*, as well as other crimes Nero regarded as accomplishments. That Alexander acted as informer is also brought out by the word 'reward,' for Nero's rewards for informers were fabulous, and included a portion of their victim's estate. Paul's estate was small, but his Lord would see to it that Alexander had his reward—a truly Pauline remark.

---

[1] παρέδωκα, epistolary aorist.

[2] Philostratus, iv. 47.

◆

In the Study.

Virginibus Puerisque.

Greediness.

By the Reverend F. J. Ashley, Johannesburg.

> 'The snare is laid for him in the ground, and a trap for him in the way.'—Job 18[10].

I suppose when you visit the Zoo some of the best fun you get is feeding the monkeys, and, of course, it seems quite the right thing that what they like best is monkey-nuts. Aren't they quick to catch them? and don't they get the shells off them cleverly? and all the time keeping their eyes on you, hoping for more.

But aren't they greedy? If you throw two or three nuts one after another to a monkey quickly, he does not wait to crack and eat the first, but claps them one after the other into his mouth, till his cheeks are bulging with them. Does anything look more comical?

Have you ever wondered how monkeys are caught? They are very watchful and quick, and once they get into the trees it is hopeless going after them. Well, let me tell you how some native boys catch them, and they are able to do so because they know monkeys are greedy.

A boy will take a melon or pumpkin, cut a small hole in the top, hollow out the inside and fasten the stem to the ground where he knows the monkeys come; inside the pumpkin he puts something that rattles, a bright piece of glass or metal, and then goes and hides in the long grass. And presently here come the monkeys, chattering and playing about, and one of them knocks the pumpkin over, hears the rattle, and, wondering what that is, grabs the pumpkin, sees the hole and peeps.

Then, oh my! he's as pleased as Jacky Horner with his pie, and in goes his hand. And as soon as the native boy sees him do that, up he gets and walks up to the monkey; does not run, or stalk him, just walks straight up to him; he knows he's got that monkey.

Why? Well, you see, the hole in the top of the pumpkin is made just big enough for a monkey to squeeze his paws into with the fingers straight out, but when his fist is doubled up with that gaudy thing he wants so badly inside it, it is quite impossible for him to pull out his paw. And, of course, the pumpkin is fastened to the peg in the ground.

'Well,' you say, 'why doesn't he let it go?'

Ah, but that is just what he will not do on any account. He jabbers away with fright, pulls and tugs at the pumpkin, scratches and bites, but he *will not let go*. And the native boy knows he won't, just as he knows a dog will not let go of his bone. So that is why he calmly walks up to the monkey, picks him up by the scruff of his neck, smacks him to make him quiet, and carries him off to sell him to a white man. All because he's greedy.

Now Paul tells us in one of his letters to 'covet earnestly the best things.' And they have this virtue, that though we want them for ourselves, we also want to share them. Half the pleasure in having a good book is to say to some one else, 'Here, read this. You'll like it.'

What is more, we can only appreciate the best things by definitely making up our minds not to want the bad things. If we go after the bad things we are sure to be badly caught in the end. For what happens then is that we get into bad company, form bad habits and become the slaves of them. If you know any one who cannot leave strong drink alone, who gambles, you know some one who has been caught in a trap. Again I say to you, don't be greedy and selfish, then you will have no source of weakness in yourself, but rather be a strength to your friends. And I need hardly add that the best way to achieve this is by following our Lord faithfully.

Jim Gardner, V.C.: An Armistice Talk.

By the Reverend E. Hardee Merchant, B.A., B.D., Liverpool.

'A good soldier of Jesus Christ.'—2 Ti 2[3].

The most wonderful and romantic position in any church is that of the organ-blower. He has a little castle all to himself. There he works, away from all observers, in a kind of splendid loneliness. There is a screen which prevents any members of the congregation seeing him. And what goes on there we can never know. The other day some church officers had occasion to go behind to the place where the blower sits. Something was being done to the organ, and they were walking round. They were amused to find that for years the various organ-blowers had pencilled their names on the woodwork, so that it was possible to get a history of the organ-blowers from the pencilled record. But these youngsters had not been satisfied with writing only their names, they had covered themselves with glory by adding various titles of honour. One of them was especially prominent, 'Jim Gardner, V.C.'

That is one of the advantages of youth. You can write anything after your name. All the professions are open to you. You can have only one of them, of course, but the choice is yours. Any of the various trades are open. And it is not a matter for wonder that boys and girls change so often as they do, when there is such a dazzling choice open to them. Some of the decisions are not so changeable as people think. A boy I know wants to be a minister. He talks about it every day. One day a doctor of great charm visited his house, and since that day the boy has talked a great deal about becoming a doctor. You understand he has not really changed his mind at all. He is probably going to be a medical missionary.

For just a few years all the world is open to you, and you show people what your characters are like by the opinions you express.

Suppose you think now to yourselves what you are going to become in the next few years. Some of you are going to College and in imagination you are writing various degrees after your names. It will mean a great deal of work to realize your dreams, but still, you are making a start.

What if you were now to write down your ambitions and to hand the papers up to the pulpit? They would be very interesting. It would be very sad, of course, if none of you had thought of doing anything for the good of other people and if your papers were entirely devoted to your own honour and success. That is the first and last danger of planning, that our plans should be so narrow that no one else gets a share in what we hope to do. I think we will manage to avoid that.

When I first knew Jim Gardner it was many years after he had written on the organ. I met him first on the evening he arrived home from France after serving in the Army. His soldiering was ended, and he would soon be going back to his ordinary work. He was not a V.C., but he had done the work of a real man, and his record was that of hundreds of thousands of men who had in all simplicity done their duty. He had fulfilled the spirit of his boyish dreams.

It is a terrible thing when the letters we write after our names at the beginning never work out in our lives. One boy was taught at school to play for his side and not to think too much about his own honour. That is a promising start, with the hope of an unselfish life. But the boy forgot, and when he became a man he lived only for himself and often hindered others and made life more difficult for them. Perhaps it was a girl who planned to do a lot of good when she became bigger. But as the girl grew older she began to think of more selfish things. This girl studied being more grandly dressed than others rather than how to give people a little help. People admired her, but she was really only a very selfish person. There had been beautiful dreams, but they had not worked out.

So I like to think of Jim Gardner, who did his duty and made good.

The Christian Year.

TWENTY-FIRST SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

Religion and Common Sense.

'But we beseech you, brethren, that ye study . . . to work with your own hands. . . . Of the times and the seasons, brethren, ye have no need that I write unto you. . . . Let us, who are of the day, be sober, putting on . . . for an helmet, the hope of salvation.'—1 Th $4^{10f.}$ $5^{1.8}$.

The Apostle Paul had at least one consolation in his difficulties. His churches were founded amongst people so diverse in race and temperament—Jews, Greeks, Celts, and solid Romans—that he found himself engaged in the solution of new problems, as well as old ones, wherever he went. Whatever he could complain of, he could not complain of monotony in his ecclesiastical labours.

The Church at Thessalonica, not to break this uniformity of difference, had a peculiar tendency of its own to put all its emphasis of interest on the doctrines of the 'last things.'

That attitude of mind had two results:

It tended to divorce their religious thought and interest from their religious experience. By putting emphasis on the doctrines of the last things, it tended to shift the emphasis from the great doctrines of forgiveness and the indwelling spirit, which are the theological counterparts of a man's present religious life, if it is a Christian one, and, therefore, are the doctrines of chiefest practical importance.

It tended secondly to make them impatient of the 'daily round, the common task.' Ordinary duties became very ordinary in the brightness of the expectancy of Christ's coming; and those who had to perform them grew contemptuous of them. There was nothing for them to do, they thought, but wait a day or two—or if He should delay His coming yet awhile, a day or two more—and then the sudden light, and the establishment of a new earth. Thus they tended to divorce their thinking from ordinary practical duty, as well as to take the emphasis off the religion of experience.

To these friends of his the Apostle gave two pieces of advice. The first was to go on working, even though the Lord was at hand. Let us remember that the Apostle said that, and thought that; and that the value of his advice is only heightened by the fact that he himself expected the quick coming of Christ. On the other hand, he advised them (though not so explicitly) to recognize the extent of Christian ignorance and confidence. 'Ye yourselves know perfectly that the day of the Lord cometh as a thief in the night.' That is to say, 'though we expect it soon, ye know perfectly well that ye know nothing about it.' But, 'our God hath not appointed us to wrath, but to obtain salvation, by our Lord Jesus Christ, who died for us that, whether we wake or sleep, we should live together with him.' That is to say, there is something that you *do* know. And what you know is enough.

In these two instructions, two points are suggested for our consideration:

The ordinary active life is not opposed to the religious life.

When the barriers of Christian ignorance are frankly acknowledged, we find that we know enough generously to support, at their height, the lives which God has given us.

1. In the first place, then, Paul urges, and especially upon those anxious for electric religious uplift, the duty and value of the daily task.

Not the least service our ordinary routine does us is its splendid defensive quality against our own faculty of thought. Set a man entirely loose from present occupation, and his will need to be a mind extraordinarily ruled of Christ, if it is to keep its peace. 'The devices and desires' would be at him; and he, although the grace of God is wonderful indeed, would be defenceless against them. Wherefore the Almighty gives him work to do. It takes him, say, ten hours in the day; and planning for to-morrow fills a good many of the rest. Really, God treats us as we need, which is like children. We get fretful, and ask unmanly questions, and the great, kind Father hands us a spade, and says, 'Go, dig'; or a pen, and says, 'Go, write; and forget the questions for a little.' If we still rebel, a great voice, speaking clear and loud through Nature, and with a poignant tenderness from the Cross, cries unto us, 'Work and trust.' And if we hearken, a very gracious whisper comes, 'What ye know not now, ye shall know hereafter.'

Furthermore, it is our daily task that forces us into large human relations. If, in the first instance, it serves to save us from ourselves, in the second, it gives us the opportunity of fulfilling the law of Christ, which is to bear one another's burdens. It not only defends us, but it helps us to grow.

Now, the family and the social circle aid in the same way; but, for many of us, it is our daily task that chiefly aids. It forces us to live not where we would, but where we can. It brings us into touch with all sorts and conditions of men. It forces us to see a good deal of the burden and sorrow of life. A man free from daily duty is in horrible danger of creating a palace of delight for himself. If he has not to pursue duty, the chances are that he will pursue pleasure, not necessarily in any ignoble sense. Himself free from life's stress he does not want to see it, so he puts himself in fair surroundings, selects the most congenial companions, and lets the world go by—or at least that section of it which is ugly and uncongenial, and, above all, that section which is at all suggestive of tears. That is not in the least an unfair description of a good many 'independent' men.

The daily task also develops the simple power of going on. The very monotony of things, rightly used, helps. The same things have to be done every day. But, when they are done, and against the grain, one thing more has been gained than their accomplishment. The worker has developed in that splendid power of patience, wherein, so Jesus says, men win their lives.

Wherefore, we reject with strong emphasis the thought of worthy Christian people, who find the daily task a barrier to their knowledge of God. On the contrary, it is one of God's great ministries; for it advances the knowledge of the good. And the good is God. At the same time it was religious folk who were working. If a man shuts God out of his life, on the 'God-has-nothing-to-do-with-business' principle, he is not likely to gain great comfort. A man must soak his work in a great thought of God, doing those things that are honest to his own conscience, before, slowly, he may find his duty an instrument for bringing him into the kingdom of righteousness, peace, and joy.

2. Ay! but it is hard, even so, to go on knowing little of beginnings and endings. It is hard to continue in the dark. But is it so dark that we cannot divine? The times and seasons are, indeed, hidden. Let us be frank and honest about it. Let us admit that we do not know what we do not know. But let us be equally emphatic about what we do know. We *can* mark an extraordinary Power making for righteousness. We *can* learn of a great Beneficence making for peace. These facts are there to be tested by experience. We *can* discern the Father. Wherefore let us on with the helmet of good hope. 'Fear not, little flock; it is your Father's good pleasure to give you the kingdom.'[1]

Twenty-second Sunday after Trinity.

The Pathfinder.

'I will instruct thee and teach thee in the way which thou shalt go: I will counsel thee with mine eye upon thee.'—Ps 32^8 (R.V.).

When an expedition sets forth on the deserts of Cathay, with all its uncertainties, the natives greet the departing caravan with a farewell shout, 'May there be a road!'

Contemplating great national movements we come to believe in 'the man and the hour'; that the man and the juncture arrive together, and that his joy and glory are bound up with his devotion to the cause for the success of which he came into the world. But this is not only true for the elect few who are destined to control imperial movements; we believe it is equally so as it concerns all men. Of course, the harmony is not so palpably manifest in the case of the ordinary individual as in that of the famous historical actor, but we are compelled to believe it equally true. There is a particular line of life drawn by God's finger, along which we best realize ourselves, most effectually serve society, and most assuredly attain life's great end.

---

[1] J. R. P. Sclater, *The Enterprise of Life*, 201.

This conception of life implies the tremendous truth that the ordained path may be missed. Migrating birds occasionally lose their way. From one cause or another instinct fails, or is thwarted, and the creature strays into an unfamiliar region in which it is supremely unhappy. The human being is liable to the same misfortune. 'As a bird that wandereth from her nest, so is a man that wandereth from his place' (Pr 27[8]). The scientist tells that, so far as Nature is concerned, we live in a world of fitnesses, that we have to search to find misfits, and when we think that we have found them, we have generally made a mistake. How different it appears when we turn to society!

What are the reflections suggested by this state of things?

1. *The necessity of supernatural direction* is forced upon us. 'O Lord, I know that the way of man is not in himself: it is not in man that walketh to direct his steps' (Jer 10[23]). 'Education is the discerner of men,' writes Ruskin; and undoubtedly true education reveals latent intellectual qualities and aptitudes, so tending directly to reduce the disharmonies of society, only it is more easy to discern men than to place them. Now psychology, striking deeper still, sets itself to decipher the subtle hieroglyphics inscribed in the constitution of every fresh being, and to adjudge them the niche they can best fill. Finally, we congratulate ourselves that in the absence of the instinct of direction possessed by bird and beast, we enjoy the faculty of reason by which we are supposed to detect and evade every false way. Yet, at last, we are conscious that in spite of all our gifts and expedients, our utmost worldly wisdom, we are unequal to the vast experiment of living, of choosing the best way, of so directing our steps as to answer life's great end. Something more is required for the full realization of the Divine design than what the most richly-gifted possess. In a word, to compass the Divine design we need Divine illumination.

2. The aim of the Divine leading must be kept in view. The goal that we propose is not always that designed by God. We become the victims of false ideals, and are apt to conclude that we are on the right path only when it leads to temporal enjoyment and aggrandizement. Anatole France writes: 'When the road is strewn with flowers, do not ask whither it leads.' Pleasure is to be accepted as the end of life, and we are to infer that we have chosen the right road when it is strewn with roses. A Sanscrit proverb sounds a better note, still far from the whole truth, 'That is the road which is trodden by the great.' That is, we are to regard wealth, greatness, and glory, as the reigning ideals, and to be satisfied only whilst we find ourselves on the paths promising splendid prizes. But these are not the objects proposed by the government of God. 'For my thoughts are not your thoughts, neither are your ways my ways,' saith the Lord. Circumstances are only means to the end, however splendid they may appear; the end contemplated is that through discipline the spiritual powers of the redeemed are brought to light and glorious action.

'I am the light of the world: he that followeth me shall not walk in darkness, but shall have the light of life' (Jn 8[12]). The King's highroad is 'the way of holiness'; the path bearing the footprints of the Greatest. His path was not always strewn with flowers, far from it, but we know that even when stained by blood it was the royal road.

We are apt to think that whilst the worldly lot agrees with our constitutional trend, and events move smoothly, we are in the providential way, but as soon as friction sets in we imagine ourselves on a wrong course. It is, in fact, God's larger, higher purpose crossing our inferior thought and ambition. For the highest end Nature itself must be suspended, contradicted, varied, or sacrificed. 'There is a way which seemeth right unto a man, but the end thereof are the ways of death' (Pr 14[12]). May we not say that there is a way which seemeth wrong unto a man, but the end thereof are the ways of life? God's transcending control contradicts, for the time and occasion at least, what seems most agreeable with natural happiness and social welfare. The distasteful task, the uncongenial society, the discordant marriage, the hateful neighbourhood, appear so many unfortunate associations, and yet may better serve our highest interest than the smooth, the pleasant, the successful. The unfitness of the worldly environment enhances the spiritual life.

3. *To identify ourselves with the Divine purpose* is the security of life. 'Teach me thy way, O

Lord' (Ps 27[11]). Unamuno writes: 'Goodness is the best source of spiritual clear-sightedness.' If a man has faith in God, joined to a life of purity, and moral elevation, his sense of the right, the true, the safe, will be unfailing. The Spirit of God enhances the normal perceptions and judgment of such, and in the bewildering hour light arises in the darkness. He who is sincere and inspired, the golden lamp of revelation in his hand, the light of the Spirit in his heart, finds life no erratic pilgrimage, tortured and despairing. In deepest eclipse may he confidently affirm: 'But he knoweth the way that I take; when he hath tried me, I shall come forth as gold. My foot hath held fast to his steps; his way have I kept, and turned not aside' (Job 23[10f.]).

What a sense of strength and serenity does the knowledge of God's leadership impart! 'I will counsel thee with mine eye upon thee.' It is great indeed to live in the care of the living God, not to be left to abstract laws and precepts, to prudence and policy, to the wisdom of the world. It is sweet to know that in life and death He is ever, in His own way, drawing us to Himself.

If we are to enjoy this sense of protection how carefully must we guard the sensitiveness of the soul, so that we may discern the Divine impulse! James Sully tells this story of a German musician who was a friend of his: 'He was of so nicely balanced a nervous organization that once when I asked him to play a piece of Schumann just after smoking a cigarette, he declined in a shocked sort of way.' If, then, a narcotic particle can disqualify an artist for high music, what care must we give for the preservation of our spiritual sensibility![1]

Twenty-third Sunday after Trinity.

The Things that remain.

'Be watchful, and strengthen the things which remain.'—Rev 3[2].

There is a certain sad comfort in being reminded that the Christian Church began to fall from grace while a father could still tell his son the story of Pentecost as an eye and ear witness. The glory of Sardis, the city, was already gone when the letter to the seven churches was written. Now there is nothing left of the city but dim memories and two lonely columns of a pagan temple, and nothing is left of the church save the message which rebuked and assured it; but one phrase of that message haunts us still with its pathetic testimony to the transient estate of all human things and its terse insistence upon the duty of strongly maintaining what is left: 'Be watchful, and strengthen the things which remain.' All the wearing tides of time and our power to stand against them meet in these eight words. I spent the end of a cloudless afternoon last summer about the Roman amphitheatre at Nîmes, says Dr. Gaius Glenn Atkins of Auburn Theological Seminary, New York. Its ellipse is still complete, its arches are unbroken, its stone seats can still be used. But time had clothed it with an indefinable sense of things done and ended. Marcus Aurelius may have seen its foundations laid. The Vandals had explored its passages. The Goths had made a fortress of it. The Saracens had held it for a little till Karl Martell drove them out. It had echoed the songs of Troubadours and, possibly, the prayers of embattled French Protestantism, and now of all such far-off unhappy things as these it alone was left. And in a slow, careful way Nîmes or France was strengthening what remained. There were workmen's tools and builders' materials stored in archways the gladiators had used. Old columns had new capitols, there were fresh-cut stones where old stones had fallen out as though they could no longer bear any weight at all. The very sound of the craftsmen's hammer re-echoed the insistence of our text—'Be watchful, and strengthen the things which remain.'

Let us consider all this as it bears upon our own estate and duty.

1. Be watchful, and *strengthen the things which have remained.* It is every man's fate to live amongst the remains of his idealisms and keep intact only a part—and often the lesser part—of the brave confidence with which he set out. Life is not kind to dreams and tries the temper of our ideals with disillusioning experience. We bring no love unworn to life's midmost heights, nor any goodness unstained, nor any faith across which the chill shadow of doubt has not sometimes fallen. What shall we do, then, with what is left? Dismiss what we have kept because it seems so inconsequential compared with what we have lost, and, because so much is gone, let what remains go also? By no means. What is left has a force only the strongly tested can possibly possess. Whatever endures is deeply rooted in some element of reality.

The hearthstone love which has outlasted the friction of intimate daily comradeship, the quiet blessed friendly warmth of it is worth more than any love that went out shining and untried to meet the dawn. We may begin with all the faith of all the creeds, and end with a bare handgrip on God that is always slipping and never slips, and that last unbroken strand of faith, which no brute fact has broken nor any acid experience dissolved, will prove the power to link our soul to the Eternal. Whatever goodness we have achieved and kept through temptation and moral failure and the wreck of resolution, has a fire-tested quality to make it the corner-stone of a goodness for which evil will have no allure and against which the gates of hell cannot prevail.

---

[1] W. L. Watkinson, *The Stability of the Spiritual*, 59.

We are not asked to strengthen the faith with which we began, rehabilitate the undisciplined characters of the banished years, recapture the ardour of some pristine love. We whom time has tried are asked only to begin with what is left. 'Red Rust' is the story of a handful of seed wheat. The hero—if the sad son of a Swedish immigrant can ever be a hero—lived a poor, bare life. But he was mind-kin and soul-kin to the great scientists. He puzzled out for himself, with a gleam from Darwin and a hint from somewhere else, the secret of plant-breeding. He saw successive harvests, which might have eased a little the cruel pressure of poverty, ruined, sometimes by frost, sometimes by drought, sometimes in a summer night by red rust, and he gave his life to find a grain to suit the climate and the soil. He saved what was left after each disaster. He sent to Sweden for wheat which his father remembered to have ripened in a short northern summer. He crossed the seed which lived through a rainless season with the seed that ripened before the frost came. He saved a dozen heads of wheat from a rust-ruined field, crossed his handful once more, created a new grain from scanty harvests sifted by the years and heat and frost and rust, and left to the north-west the seed wheat of the world's bread. He had strengthened the things that had remained; they made the future rich.

2. Be watchful, and *strengthen the things that should remain*. Even the time-tested is not always the time-approved. Whatever endures has both meaning and power, but not always by the truest tests enduring value. We are by the grace of God judges and dividers. Whatever has outlasted the discipline of time and the correction of experience passes in review before us while we, with our own consent, renew its ancient leasehold over our souls and society or forbid its further empire. Nay, this freighted current of the years does not pass before us; it passes through us. It uses our wills and our affections for its channelled way. Our judgments are the sceptres which the past extends over the future, our resolutions furnish what would otherwise be an army of ghosts with weapons to conquer by. These things, whose right to rule has long since been forfeited, have neither body, voice, nor weapon till they have won us and made us their tools.

It belongs to youth to assert itself against what ought not to endure any longer, and to bring its gallant and unwasted force to the support of all those things which ought to endure. In this use of the text the emphasis falls strongly upon the cautioning phrase. Be watchful—moral alertness is a very necessary virtue. Those unworthy claimants for a future which would be far better without them are unsleeping. They solicit us in the guise of our own interests and destinies; they spread abroad to all the winds banners of pride and patriotism and plead an immemorial usage. They support themselves with the sanctity of dear association. It is never an easy thing to disentangle the strangely mingled fabrics of life.

The ageless associations of valour and loyalty with war must be undone—and valour and loyalty furnished with a more humane and righteous support. There has always been a star-dust glory to light the black horror of a battlefield with the intimations of what we are able to do and bear and give when life itself is dedicated to the hazard of a great cause. We still need to take star dust and use it to make the securities of peace as splendid as the risks of war. Our religion is entangled with old survivals and older supports. Some of them can be changed to meet new needs of more discerning spirits, others have served their purpose, and others still are becoming a positive hindrance, and yet, like the weathering wall, they are penetrated by the tendrils of some living growth of faith and devotion. It will need a sure and delicate touch to feel among all the tendrils of the soul and, without fatally wounding them, attach them to new supports or feed them with a force to stand alone. That is the task of the ministry of the next generation if religion is to increase its growth. Be watchful—but be tender and patient too.

And be intelligent. This whole great process of strengthening the things that should remain involves a rare quality of moral judgment. We have to judge not only the certainly wrong—which is easy—but all the things more or less colourless in themselves and having no moral value, save in their relation to vaster and more significant interests—which is desperately difficult. From our own dearly bought point of vision we see now how often humanity has contended for the dust and missed the strategic heights which have commanded their future. We need to choose for survival always with a far vision. And lest so great a mandate should seem to have no meaning for the most of us, let us remember that we are never doing anything else than choosing the things that shall remain. Our choices and our visions, our obediences and rebellions, our lives and loyalties, our labours and wearinesses are all aspects of an eternal process.

3. Finally, *strengthen the things that do remain.* So far, our own lonely responsibilities have been urged as though there was no seat of judgment above our own, no court of final appeal; as though we ourselves could create the enduring by choosing it. There was never a stranger mingling of truth and fallacy. We do not really determine what shall endure. That is, in the nature of things, an aspect of eternal reality, the undergirding power of God. We only choose whether our days and our ways shall fall in with the current of the abiding, or, in the majestic phrase of Bossuet, be caught in the current of the transient and carried down into the abyss of oblivion. For there are two currents whose flow we can trace through all the experiences of our humanity. They use the same channels, they seem to reflect the same lights. And yet give them a vast enough reach and one vanishes and one endures. St. Paul saw the marble-crowned Acropolis in all its mellow-pillared perfectness. He saw Nero's Golden House and Imperial standards above mailed legions. He heard the echoes of Platonic philosophy in the streets of Athens, and Rabbinic lore in the streets of Jerusalem, and he saw the shadow of doom across them all.

In one inspired moment he saw the ultimate issues, the undergirding realities so near they beat with his pulse, so strong they carried him toward their own timeless ends. 'Now abideth faith and hope and love.' That is all. Here are the ultimate tests of every issue which demands our suffrage, every cause which asks our permission to go on. Are they in the direction of faith and hope and love? Do they establish our confidence in those things which, though unseen, are the enduring? Do they fill the world with a braver expectation of an outcome worth the cost of life to man and to God? Do they make love more real and more commanding? Let us choose them, then, and make our own souls their support and guard. We must lose ourselves in something—or else we shall never find ourselves at all. But no man can perish who loses himself in the abiding. Be watchful and strengthen the things that remain.[1]

Twenty-fourth Sunday after Trinity.

The Unity of the Race: An Armistice Sermon.

'One God and Father of all.'—Eph 4^6.

1. It is about the Church—the great Church, the total Church—that the Apostle is speaking when he uses the words 'One God and Father of all.' That great Church had its local manifestations, for already Christianity had gained a footing in places as far apart as Jerusalem, Antioch, Ephesus, Corinth, and Rome. In all these places Christian churches—local fellowships—had been formed. These local churches differed amongst themselves in method and practice and polity, but, in spite of all their external differences, they together formed one 'body,' and knew themselves to be one great Church, because, whether in Antioch, Ephesus, Corinth, Rome, or Jerusalem, they had one Lord, one faith, one baptism, one God and Father.

It is, therefore, quite clear that it is of God's relationship to the Christian people that these words were originally written. All Christian people are one because they have one God and Father. But while God is Father to believing people in a special and intimate way, He is also the Father of all mankind. Our Lord speaks of God as Father in that inclusive and universal sense. In the case of the Christian the filial relationship to God is a *realized* relationship; in the case of non-believing people it is an *un*realized relationship. As Dr. Dale used to put it: 'God is the Father of all men, but all men are not sons.' But the fact that a relationship is not realized does not affect the fact that such a relationship exists. The universal Fatherhood of God is a New Testament truth. So that, while we may be departing slightly from the original application of the phrase of the text, we shall certainly not be travelling beyond the orbit of Christian truth, if we use it as descriptive of God's relationship to the whole of mankind, and find the ultimate ground for belief in the unity of the race, and justification for our faith that the race will one day realize itself as 'one body' in the great fact that there is 'one God and Father of us all.'

2. The revelation that God was One, and that He was the Only, was one of the most tremendous truths ever flashed into the mind of man. It has profoundly affected thought and practical life. It has had certain great and momentous consequences.

To begin with, it has given us a universe, a cosmos, a rational and intelligible world. There could be no *universe* if various gods were at work in this world of ours, prosecuting their own plans and furthering their own purposes. That accounts for the sigh of relief with which—according to Dr. Glover—an educated Japanese welcomed the proclamation of the Christian gospel. 'One God,' he exclaimed, 'not eight millions; that was joyful news to me.' One of the regulative ideas of our time is that of the uniformity of Nature. There is nothing accidental or haphazard or casual about Nature—Nature can be depended on. Astronomers, for example, can forecast to the minute the coming of an eclipse. But what is the uniformity of Nature but the scientific aspect of the unity of God? We have a world which we can decipher and understand, a universe and not a chaos, because behind all Nature's phenomena there is a Mind, a single Mind; because God, one God, works all and in all.

---

[1] G. G. Atkins in *Christian World Pulpit*, cxv. 90.

One God, one law, one element,
And one far-off divine event,
To which the whole creation moves.

But it all starts with the 'one God.' 'One law' because there is 'one God.'

And as it makes our world a universe, so it justifies us in believing there is meaning and purpose in life—the life both of the individual and of the world. To believe in a multitude of gods, playing at cross-purposes, using men and women as pawns in their game, is to reduce life to a tale told by an idiot, full of sound and fury, signifying nothing. We are able to believe that things work together for good only because we believe there is one God at work, and He a good and loving God. And we are able to believe that, in spite of delays and set-backs and reactions, there is some 'far-off divine event to which the whole creation moves' only because we believe in One God, One Sovereign Lord steadily bringing to pass His own chosen and determined purpose.

And, further, the unity of God carries with it the unity of the race. Humanity is one wherever we find it. It is one in spite of differences of colour and physiognomy and speech. It is one in spite of the vast differences in development which separate the child races of Africa and the South Seas from the finished product of Western civilization—one because created by the same God, with fundamentally the same feelings and instincts and aspirations. 'We are His offspring!' All men can make that great and stupendous statement.

3. Our Lord, in His teaching about God, built upon the foundations laid by the prophets. He started from this great truth—the climax of the prophetic revelation: that God was One and that He was good and holy—but He added another truth to it, a truth about the *nature* of God, a truth which has transfigured our very conception of God, and given us a God whom we cannot only fear and reverence, but love. 'And Father,' that is the addition Jesus made. St. Paul could never have penned the brief sentence of the text, had he not sat at the feet of Christ and learned of Him. 'One God and *Father*!' The fact that God is One carries with it the truth of the unity of the race. But this further truth, which our Lord revealed, makes of our race something warmer and more intimate than a unity: it makes it a *family*.

Now, the Fatherhood of God has become an accepted truth, at any rate amongst Christian nations. But the consequential truth of the unity of the race, of the real brotherhood of men, still waits for a practical acceptance.[1]

Here on the Sunday before Armistice Day we are called to remember our dead:

What shall we give to the men who have died?
Order or cross for their mourners' pride?
Can the dead so cheaply be satisfied?

What shall we do for these gallant dead?
To the widow money, to the children bread?
Can this debt be paid at so much a head?

What shall we give to the men who have died?
What guerdon asks the Crucified?
That His friends bear fruit and the fruit abide.[2]

'Brethren, we are debtors.' Do we believe that God meant the human race, of all nations and kindreds and peoples and tongues, to be a family, one family under one Father—God? If we do, then why don't we get busy making it so?

'Peace is proclaimed,' said M. Briand in his impassioned speech before the signing of the Kellogg Pact; 'it is well: it is much. But it still remains necessary to organize it. In the solution of difficulties, *right*, and not might, must prevail.

'That is to be the work of to-morrow. At this unforgettable hour the conscience of the peoples, pure and rid of all national selfishness, is sincerely endeavouring to attain these serene regions where human *brotherhood* can be felt in the beatings of one and the same heart. Let us seek a common idea within which we can all merge our fervent hopes and give up any selfish thoughts. As there is not one of the nations represented here but has shed her blood in the last war, I propose that we should dedicate to the dead, to all the dead of the Great War, the event which we are going to consecrate together by our signatures.'

---

[1] J. D. Jones, *The Inevitable Christ*, 183.

[2] A. W. Pollard.

On Tuesday, the 3rd of September this year, the Prime Minister took a further step in the organizing of peace when he announced to the Assembly of the League of Nations at Geneva that the optional clause of the Hague Statute was to be signed by England. Referring to the Kellogg Peace Pact for the renunciation of war, the Prime Minister said that the British Government, and he was sure everybody else, was desirous that the Pact should not merely be a declaration on paper, but should be translated into constitutions and institutions that will work for the peace of the world.

But institutions, we know, are not enough. The League of Nations deserves the eager and prayerful support of all Christian people, because it aims at preventing a recurrence of war. It has already accomplished much, and has thereby placed the world in its debt. But the truth is, the League of Nations, in and of itself, is insufficient to guarantee the world's peace. Behind it, if it is to be effective, there must be a mind, a public mind, and it must be a new mind. Was it not Monsieur Briand who said that before disarmament could become a practical policy there would have to be a 'disarmament of the mind'? That is true! But we need something more radical even than a disarmament of the mind; we want the creation of a *new* mind. Men act as they think. If they think in terms of a nation's interests and supposed prestige, they will act as nations, and that is certain to mean antagonism and strife. Not until they think in terms of the race will the peace of the world be secure. Our Lord was always insisting upon the new mind, or the 'new heart' as He expressed it.

And how shall men get this 'new mind,' this 'new heart'? Well, the regular meeting of the representatives of the various nations in the Assembly of the League is doing something to create it. But it is only Jesus Christ who can really give it. As men learn of Him, receive His Spirit, they get new outlooks, new ideals, new motives, new inspirations. They are literally 'born again.' When Christ is truly received, He gives men the new mind, He abolishes the enmities, and teaches men to love one another. This is not mere theorizing. History affirms the truth of it. There was no fiercer or more vehement nationalist than the Apostle Paul was in his early days. He was a Hebrew of the Hebrews. But, when Christ was born in him, he got a new mind. All his Jewish prejudices died, and he took the world to his heart. Jew and Gentile turned to one another and clasped hands, and said: 'Beloved, if God so loved us, we ought also to love one another.'

'I attended,' says Dr. J. D. Jones, 'a great religious conference in Boston, U.S.A., many years ago. The platform of the hall in which we met was decorated with flags—the flags of the various nations represented in the conference. But in the middle were hung side by side, and interfolded, the Union Jack and the Stars and Stripes. Above those two flags there was hung another flag—a small flag, which consisted of a Cross on a white ground. One day an American speaker explained to us strangers what that tiny flag with the Cross on it meant. It was the flag that floated at the mast-head of American warships during Divine Service. "It is the only flag," he added, "that ever floats above the Stars and Stripes." On that day it was floating above the Union Jack as well. The Union Jack and the Stars and Stripes were, so to speak, linked together by the flag with the Cross on it. But it is not the Union Jack and the Stars and Stripes alone which will float side by side, but the flags of all the nations will float in friendship and peace side by side when the flag with the Cross on it floats over them all.'

Books that have influenced our Epoch.

Carlyle's 'Sartor Resartus.'

By Professor W. P. Paterson, D.D., LL.D., The University, Edinburgh.

Carlyle's *Sartor Resartus* ranks in English Literature as the work of a man of genius who had unique command of the resources of our composite language, blended glowing imagination with grim humour, and in his impassioned prose often reached the sublime. And the substance is as remarkable as the literary form. It is primarily an investigation into the nature and the functions of clothes. From this it passes to Philosophy, indicates a theory of knowledge, and outlines a metaphysical interpretation of man and the world in relation to God. Further, the philosophical message is illustrated, negatively and positively, by chapters of the spiritual autobiography of the author, who appears under the mask of the German Professor Teufelsdröckh. Finally, the writer being a lay-preacher, he seeks to make his doctrine profitable for correction, for reproof, and for instruction in righteousness.

I.

Clothes Proper and their Uses.

Reasons for wearing clothes must have been given ever since there was a language in which to express ideas. In later times much has been written about dress by the poet, the historian, and the novelist. In the *Tale of a Tub*, Dean Swift showed that it was an excellent subject for the satirist. Acknowledging a debt to Swift, Carlyle recognizes five uses which raiment has served in the economy of human life.

(*a*) Clothes serve for warmth and protection. As a babe, 'what hadst thou been without thy blankets, and bibs, and other nameless hulls? Dost thou not rejoice in them as in a warm movable House, a Body round thy Body, wherein that strange THEE of thine sat snug, defying all variations of Climate?' (Bk. i. ch. 9).

(*b*) They serve for adornment. 'The pains of Hunger and Revenge once satisfied, man's next care was Decoration. For Decoration he must have Clothes. Nay, among wild people, we find tattooing and painting even prior to Clothes' (i. 5).

(*c*) They serve to conceal. To them we owe decency, and also much more. 'Is not Shame the soil of all good manners and good morals? When we view the fair clustering flowers that overwreathe, for example, the Marriage-bower, and encircle man's life with the fragrance and hues of Heaven, what hand will not smite the foul plunderer that grubs them up by the roots?' (iii. 3).

(*d*) They serve to reveal. They have symbolical significance, and it lies in the nature of a symbol that it reveals as well as conceals. To some extent a man is known by his clothes as well as by his friends. In particular there is one kind of man—'the dandiacal body'—who makes known through the excessive adornment of his person the absurd value which he sets on himself. For 'this Dandiacal Sect is but a new modification, adapted to the new time, of that primeval superstition, Self-worship' (iii. 10).

(*e*) They have a mystic efficacy in influencing human conduct. 'Is not the fair fabric of Society itself, with all its royal mantles and pontifical stoles, whereby we are organised into Polities, into Nations, and a whole co-operating Mankind, the creation of the Tailor alone?' (iii. 11). Consider, for example, the power which goes forth from the judge in virtue of the robes he wears. 'You see two individuals, one dressed in fine Red, the other in coarse threadbare Blue: Red says to Blue, "Be hanged and anatomised"; Blue hears with a shudder, and (O wonder of wonders!) marches sorrowfully to the gallows; is there noosed-up, vibrates his hour, and the surgeons dissect him, and fit his bones into a skeleton for medical purposes' (i. 9).

In view of these considerations, and chiefly because of the mystic efficacy, it was submitted that it was high time to revise the current estimate of the dignity of the tailor's craft. The patcher ought to be re-patched, the tailor re-tailored, by enlightened opinion. Still more evident was this when it was realized—which is the next step in the argument—that there are spiritual forms of tailoring which have produced many of the most important things, both in the social sphere and in the realm of Nature, and that the Tailors' Guild might therefore include such craftsmen as the lawgiver, the poet, and the prophet.

II.

Clothes Metaphorical and a Philosophy.

To the witty or poetical minds which are in the habit of comparing ideas, it has naturally occurred that there are other beings than the human biped which have wrappings that are similar to clothes, and that render similar service. The most obvious parallel is the case of the individual writ large—the collective personality of a society, of a nation, or of the race. A second object with its vestments of a sort is the universe. The third—with reverence be it spoken—is God. What is the nature of the raiment of these three, and what the significance of the interpretation for life and conduct, it is the chief purpose of *Sartor Resartus* to declare and illustrate.

1. *The Clothing of Nations.*—In the case of human societies the clothes consist of their equipment of institutions, laws, customs, and religious beliefs, along with 'the solemnities and paraphernalia of civilised life.' The analogy had been used by Burke to give point to his strictures on the vandalism of the French Revolution. It was, he

conceived, the attempt of a people, or at least of a mob, to strip itself of the garments of chivalry and loyalty which it requires for decency, not to speak of adornment and dignity. By this new conquering Empire of Reason all the decent drapery of life was to be rudely torn away. 'All the super-added ideas, furnished from the wardrobe of a moral imagination which the heart needs, and which the understanding ratifies as necessary to cover the defects of our naked shivering nature, and to raise it to dignity in our own estimation, are to be exploded as a ridiculous, absurd, and antiquated fashion' (*Works*, 1808, v. p. 151).

Carlyle agreed with this view of the value of national habiliments and gave additional reasons in its support. They not only imparted beauty and dignity: they served the purpose of protecting a people from injury and even of preserving its life. Not least was this true of the religious creed which might be called the Church-clothes. 'I remark that without such Vestures and sacred Tissues society has not existed, and will not exist. For if Government is the outward Skin of the Body Politic, holding the whole together and protecting it, then is Religion the inmost Pericardial and Nervous Tissue, which ministers Life and warm Circulation to the whole. Without which Pericardial Tissue the Bones and Muscles (of Industry) were inert, the Skin would become a shrivelled pelt, and Society itself a dead carcase' (iii. 2). He also found that state-raiment signally exercises the mystic power which was noted in clothes—as seen in the spell which is laid by national symbols upon the imagination and the heart. 'Have not I myself known five—hundred living soldiers sabred into crows'-meat for a piece of glazed cotton, which they called their Flag' (iii. 3).

On the other hand, Carlyle found it necessary to press an observation which Burke slurred over—viz. that clothes wax old, when they must either be repaired or thrown aside. The Church clothes, he conceived, had gone 'sorrowfully out at elbows.' Christianity was imperishable, as it was indispensable, but there were considerable Christian doctrines which he called Hebrew old-clothes, and deemed to be no longer fit for use. He was also of opinion that England's garb of aristocracy had become shabby in the latter days. 'Where now,' he exclaims, 'are the Hengsts and Alarics of our still-growing, still-expanding Europe who, when their home is grown too narrow, will enlist, and, like Fire-pillars, guide onwards those superfluous masses of indomitable living Valour; equipped, not now with the battle-axe and war-chariot, but with the steam-engine and ploughshare? Where are they? Preserving their Game!' (iii. 4).

2. *The Vesture of the World.*—Dean Swift had described a sect of clothes-worshippers who construed the world in terms of tailoring. They held the universe, he says, 'to be a large suit of clothes which invests everything; that the earth is invested by the air, the air is invested by the stars, and the stars are invested by the *primum mobile.* What is that which some call land but a fine coat faced with green? or the sea but a waistcoat of water tabby?' (*Tale of a Tub*, ii.). He had added that many other applications could be made, and a student of Philosophy could readily give to the conceit a more profound turn. Since Locke, it was generally held that at least the secondary qualities are due to the perceiving subject, and these could therefore be thought of as a garment with which the mind decks and beautifies the realm of 'things in themselves.' A disciple of Berkeley could conceive of the apprehending mind not only as a tailor that clothed the world, but as a manufacturer that brought it into existence. As aptly could the idea be applied to the system of Kant, with its doctrine of the ideality of space and time, and of the all-important work done by the understanding in building up by its categories the world of experience. In 1823 Carlyle had written contemptuously of the results of the Kantian Philosophy as turning out to be 'but a helmet of rusty iron large as a kitchen-pot, and within it a head but little bigger than a nut' (Froude, *ibid.* p. 158). Three years later he went more deeply into the *Critique of Pure Reason*, when he seems to have accepted generally its theory of knowledge, and in particular to have been deeply impressed by its doctrine 'that Space and Time, the WHERE and WHEN, so mysteriously inseparable from all our thoughts, are but superficial, terrestrial adhesions to thought' (i. 8). And so the human mind, in another point of view the world, got their suit of clothes in the shape of the *a priori* elements of knowledge and especially of the forms of space and time. The uses ascribed to these clothes were mainly two. They served for adornment—so much so that in describing the work of the tailor, Carlyle often thinks of him as an artist. Space and time are 'the Canvas whereon all our Dreams and Life-visions are painted. So that this so solid-seeming World were but an air-image, our ME the only reality: and Nature, with its thousandfold production and destruction, but the reflex of our own inward Force, the "phantasy of our Dream"' (i. 8). The second use, which is rather a disservice, is that they veil the

essential nature of the world. 'Deepest of all illusory Appearances are your world-enveloping Appearances, SPACE and TIME. These, as spun and woven for us from before Birth itself, to clothe our celestial ME for dwelling here, and yet to blind it—lie all-embracing. In vain, while here on Earth, shall you endeavour to strip them off; you can, at best, but rend them asunder for moments, and look through' (iii. 8).

3. *The Garment of God.*—The youth may have heard a sermon on the God who covereth Himself with light as with a garment. The man was never tired of quoting the earth-spirit in Goethe's *Faust*:

> ''Tis thus at the roaring loom of time I ply,
> And weave for God the garment thou seest Him by.'

And it is the idea of God and His raiment that is the culmination of the message of the book.

In applying the conception to the Divine Being, Carlyle again thought chiefly of the double use of the clothes metaphorical as concealing and revealing. The garment of God in the widest sense was Nature. —the realm of Creation and Providence. Specially was man, in his greatness and littleness, a garment symbol of God that revealed in part, and that concealed in part. 'The Universe is but one vast Symbol of God; what is man himself but a Symbol of God?' in which as symbols 'the Infinite is made to blend itself with the Finite, to stand visible, and, as it were, attainable there' (iii. 3). More specially is God revealed in the gifted souls who body forth the beautiful, and render the Divine visible, in true works of Art. Most specially has He lived and wrought in the persons and the deeds of heroic men, and in the greatest of them mankind has rightly recognized and worshipped a present God. 'If thou ask to what height man has carried it in this manner, look on our divinest Symbol: on Jesus of Nazareth, and his Life. Higher has the human Thought not yet reached: a Symbol of quite perennial, infinite character; whose significance will ever demand to be anew inquired into, and anew made manifest' (iii. 3). Christ, further, as highest manifestation of the Divine, exemplified in the most impressive fashion the power that lies in the adequate symbol of the Divine to set the human heart aflame, and to incline the will to heroic self-sacrifice. In all religions one indispensable element was 'some symbolic representation whereby the Divinity was sensibly manifested,' and those who proposed a new religion without this element as did St. Simon, knew neither the genius of religion nor the springs of human action (Wilson, *ibid.* p. 207).

Carlyle nowhere definitely expounded a doctrine of the being and attributes of God. He even objected to any label being attached to his theology. In a letter to Sterling in 1835 he said: 'I am neither Pantheist nor Pottheist, nor any Theist or Ist whatsoever, having the most decided contempt for all manner of System-builders, feeling well before-hand that all such are and even must be wrong' (*ibid.* p. 389). But after all a man either is or is not a theist. He either believes or he does not believe that God is a self-conscious Spirit, possessed of moral attributes, who knows and cares for His creatures. And Theism, there is good reason to hold, was Carlyle's personal creed, though he laid such stress on the Divine immanence that he could be misconceived as identifying God with Nature, or with Nature on its inner side. He used the name of God as a name whose meaning was generally understood in a Christian country, and if he had meant by it something so radically different as the impersonal spirit of the pantheist he was too honest not to have said so. He spoke of God as 'my Father'—which name is very inappropriate in the mouth of one who does not hold God to be a self-conscious Being. He prayed to God as a person addressing himself to a person, as in the petition recorded in his Note-book, 'Grant me, O Father, enough of wisdom to live well, prosperity to live happily—easily—grant me or not, as Thou seest best' (Wilson, *ibid.* ii. p. 136). 'My belief in a special Providence,' he wrote to Emerson, 'grows yearly stronger, unsubduable, inexpugnable' (p. 385). Though Mr. Wilson says he was not interested in the Jewish Jehovah (p. 222), his French Revolution is a solemn republication of the teaching of the Hebrew Prophets as to the retributive justice of God. The theistic interpretation of his utterances, it may be added, was supported by Froude on the ground of their private intercourse. 'It was not credible to him,' he said, 'that intellect and conscience could have been placed in him by a being which had none of its own. God was to him the fact of facts. He looked on this whole system of visible and spiritual phenomena as a manifestation of the will of God in constant forces, not mechanical but dynamic, interpenetrating and controlling all existing things' (*Thomas Carlyle*, ii. p. 5).

III.

The Illustrative Experience.

The philosophy of the metaphorical clothes was no mere *jeu d'esprit*, but the exposition in fantastic form of beliefs which had had for Carlyle the character of a revelation and even the value of a gospel. This is brought out and illustrated by the portrait and biography of Professor Teufelsdröckh, who, though declared to be mythical in various particulars, and who in others was idealized, undoubtedly represented Carlyle in his birth, upbringing, and education, in his character, talents, interests, and behaviour, and, above all, in the stages of his spiritual history. The experience described in the story of the German professor is of a type which figures prominently in modern studies of the Psychology of Religion. It is the experience whose first stage is the 'primitive credulity' of the child of a Christian home; the second, a reaction of revolt and negation; the third, deliverance and a liberalized positive creed.

1. *The Faith of Childhood.*—Carlyle's inherited faith was the orthodoxy of the straitest sect of Scottish Evangelicalism. And this was commended to the boy by authorities before which he bowed in reverence. His father, James Carlyle, mason by trade, with powers of thought and speech comparable to those of the son, found a satisfying view of existence in the 'Shorter Catechism,' while he adorned his doctrine by a laborious and earnest life. His mother, also gifted, and making of her son a lifelong friend, was much in prayer for him in his intellectual pilgrimages, and saw to it that with all his learning he did not forget to read his Bible. On Sundays they worshipped in a Secession Chapel under the Rev. John Johnstone —'the priestliest man,' says Carlyle, 'I ever under any ecclesiastical guise was privileged to look upon, and in that poor temple, rude, rustic, and bare, were tongues of authentic flame which kindled what was best in me' (Froude, *op. cit.* i. 10).

With this theological training he proceeded in due course to the University of Edinburgh, intending the ministry, and on the conclusion of his Arts Course he took a partial session in the Divinity Hall. Had Chalmers filled the Chair of Divinity twenty years earlier Carlyle might have persevered in the career, but he did not come in contact with any such spiritual force, and so turned aside to school-mastering in Kirkcaldy. And now, and in the years of unemployment that followed, the doubts which had gathered in the academic period seem to have grown to a far-reaching unbelief as he made ever deeper acquaintance with the history of modern Europe and with its schools of thought.

2. *The Eclipse of Faith.*—The view of existence and life which made a temporary appeal was a thoroughgoing religious and moral scepticism. The tempter suggested that God is a dream and the one solid reality the material world. And for a season it was the hour and the power of darkness in the form of Materialism. 'To me the Universe was all void of Life, of Purpose; it was one huge, dead, immeasurable Steam-engine, rolling on, in its dead indifference, to grind me limb from limb.' 'It is all a grim Desert, this once-fair world of his; wherein is heard only the howling of wild-beasts, or the shrieks of despairing, hate-filled men, and no Pillar of Cloud by day, and no Pillar of Fire by night, any longer guides the Pilgrim' (ii. 7). As to Morality, the tempter suggested that it was a convention whose authority had been much overstated. What we call duty 'was no divine Messenger and Guide, but a false earthly Fantasm made-up of Desire and Fear; Virtue some bubble of the blood, bubbling in the direction others *profit* by' (ii. 7). The 'Everlasting No,' the spirit of negation (Gœthe's *Geist der stets verneint*), was felt to have the best of the argument. 'As he wanders wearisomely through this world, our friend has now lost all tidings of another and higher. He hides not that, in those days, he was wholly irreligious: "Doubt had darkened into Unbelief," till you have the fixed, starless, Tartarean black' (ii. 7). Yet in one point he did not give way. If he could not disbelieve the Spirit that denies, he could at least hate him. If he must accept the theory of a godless universe, at least he need not cower before the Juggernaut. 'The Everlasting No had said: "Behold, thou art fatherless, outcast, and the Universe is mine (the Devil's)"; to which my whole Me now made answer: "I am not thine, but Free, and forever hate thee!"' (ii. 7). The moral consciousness at least was unsubdued.

3. *The Deliverance.*—Upon this grim and prolonged struggle there followed the experience which he was not ashamed to call a conversion. He even gloried in the word as signifying 'a new-attained progress in the Moral Development of man: hereby has the Highest come home to the bosoms of the most Limited' (ii. 10). What had been hidden from Socrates and Plato had been revealed to your Zinzendorfs, your Wesleys, and the poorest of their Pietists and Methodists. It is true that the conversion reported in *Sartor Resartus* was lacking in features which were central in the evangelical type of religious experience. The writer showed little sense of his own sinfulness, said nothing about deliverance from the guilt of sin, and seemed to feel no need of any form of atonement. But it was still a conversion of a real kind, which coincided

with the traditional evangelical form in at least four important particulars.

(*a*) The conversion began with illumination. The theological treatment recognizes a first stage in which the mind is enlightened in the knowledge of Christ, and in Carlyle's version this was repeated in more general terms. 'It is with man's Soul as it was with Nature: the beginning of Creation is—Light. Divine moment, when over the tempest-tossed Soul, as once over the wild-weltering Chaos, it is spoken: Let there be Light!' (ii. 9). In his case the content of the revelation was that the fundamental reality is Spirit—not matter—and that the Supreme Being is the Infinite Spirit. With this view, with which one 'trod the old rags of Matter into the mire, and exalted Spirit above all earthly principalities and powers,' it seemed to him that a man with force of vision and heart might pierce into the mystery of the world (iii. 1).

(*b*) The gospel thus apprehended was appropriated by faith. Not by mere intellectual assent, but by a saving faith that was an act of will, he made it his personal possession. The object of this faith is the God who has Nature for His garment, but who is more than the garment. 'O Heavens, is it, in very deed, HE, then, that ever speaks through thee; that lives and loves in thee, that lives and loves in me?' 'The Universe is not dead and demoniacal, a charnel-house with spectres; but godlike, and my Father's!' (ii. 9).

(*c*) There was peace and joy in believing. 'Sweeter than Dayspring to the shipwrecked in Nova Zembla; ah, like the mother's voice to her little child that strays bewildered, weeping, in unknown tumults; like soft streamings of celestial music to my too-exasperated heart, came that Evangel' (ii. 9). Peace was, indeed, no constant possession of the later years, and he did not think that man was made for happiness, but he remembered that in the conversion he had at least a foretaste of rest and blessedness.

(*d*) There was a call and an impulse to a life of new obedience. In the evangelical scheme regeneration is followed by sanctification and good works, and the sequel to the Carlylean conversion was of the same character. He was conscious of a moral elevation which could be described in the rapt moments as annihilation of self. Above all, he felt inspired and constrained to bring forth the fruits of righteousness. The deliverance, for one thing, entailed on him the duty of devoting himself to a mission. 'I too could now say to myself: Produce! Produce! Were it but the pitifullest, infinitesimal fraction of a Product, produce it, in God's name. Whatsoever thy hand findeth to do, do it with thy whole might.' It also imposed on him with new urgency the old commandment that thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself. 'With other eyes could I now look upon my fellow man: with an infinite Love, an infinite Pity. O my brother, why cannot I shelter thee in my bosom, and wipe away all tears from thy eyes!' (ii. 9).

IV.

SIGNIFICANCE AND INFLUENCE.

Sartor Resartus met with a disappointing reception. One publisher after another declined it. When at last it appeared in instalments in *Fraser's Magazine*, subscribers used strong language, and the editor was warned that he was seriously damaging its circulation. The author sardonically reproduced the general opinion when he said to an acquaintance, 'Madam, it is a work born in darkness, and destined for oblivion' (Wilson, *ibid.* p. 73). On the other hand, there were a few who agreed with Mrs. Carlyle that it had the hall-mark of genius. We hear of a Scottish minister who considered it as 'fell preaching' in its way as that of Chalmers, and of a Scottish postman who excused his absence from church by the plea that he had to finish Carlyle's wonderful book. Americans discovered that it was a big thing, and admirers began to write him and to interview him. In due course it was valued as the most characteristic utterance of an accredited prophet, became a classic, and was elucidated by commentaries. It had thus considerable influence in the mighty ferment of thought—political, philosophical, and religious—that was to develop in the course of the nineteenth century.

The political philosophy of Carlyle is contained in germ in *Sartor Resartus*, but the doctrines were too slightly handled and were set forth in too bizarre a fashion, to make much impression. They only began to work as a leaven when they had been expounded and applied in *Heroes and Hero-Worship*, the *French Revolution*, and the *Latter-day Pamphlets*. At most it could be said that the serious student learned from the oracles to look with his own eyes at the actual facts of a political situation instead of borrowing a formula about them, and also was disposed to think that there are excellent reasons both for cherishing old institutions and for making very radical attempts to reform them.

On the philosophical side the book helped to popularise fundamental tenets of the idealistic

School. He professed, as we saw, to despise systems and to have no system, but at another time he could say that 'with a basis of experience speculation finds a centre to revolve about, and to fashion itself into system' (ii. 9). As a fact he had himself reached a definite and coherent view of existence based on the principle of the primacy of spirit. And so doubtless the book has made of many a docile reader something of an idealistic philosopher, and that without his knowing it.

The chief significance of *Sartor Resartus* lies in its contribution to a Philosophy of Religion. It was the product of an age of religious storm and stress, when many had found 'that the Mythus of the Christian Religion looked not in the eighteenth century as it did in the eighth,' but also had realized afresh that the world could not dispense with the gospel which it enshrined, and with the spiritual energy which it generated. It seemed accordingly to them that two things were necessary—to redefine the essential content of Christianity, and to commend and defend it by a more effective argument. One way was to fasten on religious experience, to extract from it the essence of Christianity, and to contend that this was self-authenticating. The other was to reduce Christianity to a metaphysical and ethical doctrine, and to claim for this the support of Reason. The latter was the way which was taken by Kant and Hegel, and followed up at a later date with full equipment, by the Anglo-Hegelian School of T. H. Green, and by the Scoto-Hegelian School of the Cairds. It is in this movement that Carlyle has his place—as a fragmentary contributor, it is true, but also as a brilliant and influential British pioneer. This school of theological philosophy or philosophical theology has had to face two criticisms. It has been objected that it mutilated Christianity in defining it—as notably in the treatment by Carlyle, who only believed in miracles in the sense that everything is miracle, and who does not appear to have believed in personal immortality. But even so, it is better to believe in a fragmentary Christianity than in none. The second objection has been that Christianity was made dependent on a philosophical system, and was thus involved in the fortunes of a school whose doctrines might prove to be only a passing fashion. But while there is force in this, the spiritual philosophy to which Carlyle was a witness must be in principle as indestructible as Christianity. And certainly it was a beneficent factor in the religious life of our country during the nineteenth century. It enabled Carlyle to continue in spiritual communion with his saintly mother, and this with the honest conviction that, however they might differ in secondary matters, they were one by faith in God, and in the Son in whom He is revealed. And the friendship of Carlyle with his mother is a symbol of the effect produced in wide circles by the spiritual philosophy which has a witness in *Sartor Resartus*. For in the nineteenth century, when the everlasting No threatened to go from strength to strength, this spiritual philosophy had no small influence in keeping the highest intellectual culture of the age in friendly relations with Christianity, and in bespeaking reverence for the faith once delivered to the saints.

Incarnation versus Inspiration.

By the Reverend Norman Hook, M.A., Newbury, Berks.

Whilst it is the task and duty of every age to interpret the significance of Christ in terms that will make Him a living reality, and a magnet of irresistible attraction, it must follow that this task can only be successfully done in so far as the significance of Christ is interpreted in the thought-forms which are the commonplace of the day.

To the earliest Christians, Christ was Messiah and the pre-existent Son of God. To a later generation, He was the Eternal Logos. These were categories of thought commonplace and real to the people of the time, into which could be satisfactorily fitted the values for which Christ stood. In the course of the ages these thought-forms have changed, but the values for which Christ stands remain the same.

I do not think that any one could say that we have succeeded as yet in interpreting Christ in terms that would make Him irresistibly appeal. But if we have failed, it is due to no lack of vital interest and industry. Christ is still the dynamic centre of attraction, and more books are written about Him in one year than about any hundred of the world's heroes in a generation. The attempts which have been made, and are being made, to make Him real to this our own age, may be broadly divided into two classes. One class belongs to the category of Incarnation, and the other to the category of Inspiration. Before I proceed to define these terms for the purpose in hand, allow me to say that this distinction is perhaps more arbitrary than real, referring more to inclination and point of view than to hard-and-fast distinction. The purpose of this article is concerned with the position of those who claim that Inspiration as a theory is sufficient to explain the fact of Christ, or conversely that Incarnation is sufficient of itself to do likewise. Keeping this in mind, we may proceed to define our terms.

The term 'Inspiration' has reference to the normal means of God's indwelling in man, witnessing to the fact that it is the special prerogative of man to have fellowship with the great Spirit that is behind and above and within all things. It is not for us to define what is not the Inspiration of the Spirit, much less to confine it to religion. But if we were asked to point to an obvious illustration of Inspiration in religion, we should point, I take it, say, to the prophets of Israel. Here Inspiration is unmistakable, issuing in a lofty morality, a sensitive social conscience, and a claim to speak about the things of God with authority.

But in contradistinction to the prophets of Israel, when we speak of the Inspiration of the Christ, we use the word 'Incarnation.' This word connotes a difference. It witnesses to the belief that God has spoken absolutely and finally in Jesus, and in a way in which He has spoken neither before nor since. His case is different from the rest of men, and a different word is required to account for it. This, at least, is the point of view of Orthodoxy.

Now much of the burden of our present-day controversy is as to whether it is possible, or not, to interpret the fact of Christ along lines of Inspiration. There are those who would contend that the term 'Incarnation' is associated with pagan mythology, corresponding to nothing that is embraced within the circle of human experience. They urge that the indwelling of God in Christ must be explained along the lines of God's indwelling in any man. The difference between divinity in Christ and divinity in us is one of degree and not of kind. In so far as men respond to the great Creator-Spirit, they may be said to be inspired, and Christ was perfectly inspired because His response to the Spirit was perfect. Indeed, it may be said of Him, that in Him dwelt 'all the fulness of the Godhead bodily.' Broadly speaking, this does not unfairly represent the point of view of some of the Modernists. But to the Orthodox it is not sufficient to equate the Inspiration of Christ with the prophetic temperament, however absolutely you may qualify it. It was absolutely unique, the uniqueness constituting the very heart of the gospel; and a unique Inspiration, they would argue, demands a unique explanation, *i.e.* Incarnation.

Before criticising, it is important that we should be certain that we understand the issues. Especially should we rid our minds of such immature notions as that the Modernists are the enemies of the Faith. They are sincere men who are striving to make Christ real to themselves and to their generation, and if the Faith be the Truth, why be alarmed? The Modernist, confessing faith in the divinity of Christ, wants to link Him up with the rest of humanity. He wants to see Christ as one of us, and therefore in a real sense our Elder Brother and our Example. Above all, he desires to make Christ real to the men and women of his day. He contends that very often the Orthodox Christ is not a real Christ. The controversy, then, is by no means purely academic, and I propose to digress at this point in order to estimate its urgency.

(1) I would ask some pertinent questions by way of reference. Do the people of our parishes vitally believe that Jesus is the God-man? Are their hearts aflame with a passion to serve Him? Do they come through storm and tempest in crowds to make use of the means of grace to which He attached a command? Is religion a deep surging influence in their lives? There are some who would reply that at heart our people are sceptical, and that they do not do these things just because they have no desire to do them. Others would say that the Christ of current Orthodoxy is far removed from their understanding. Whatever be the reason, it is clear that they have not grasped or accepted the implications of what we mean by the Incarnation. WHY?

(2) I have had some little experience of contact with our very modern university students. What do they think of Christ? They speak of Him with reverence as the finest specimen of manhood that ever was. But they have a suspicion that His morality was idealistic, and is thereby not to be taken too seriously. In consequence, their views on moral questions, and especially on divorce, are distinctly 'liberal.' The miracles of the New

Testament they reject, without adequate reason, as glosses. In a word, they do not believe in what we mean by the Incarnation. WHY?

(3) The two 'WHYS' I have asked may not insignificantly be linked on to another question, namely, 'Is Christ our example?' I remember being asked this question during the War by a corporal who professed himself to be a Theosophist. His contention was that, if Christ was God as man, then obviously there was a difference between Christ and other men, and therefore the injunction that we should follow His example, far from being helpful, was only embarrassing. The answer I gave at the time was, that the question was really superfluous and unnecessary. 'Get to know Christ,' I said, 'and you will discover the power of God within you.'

I doubt whether orthodox theology can answer this question as to whether Christ is our example. Modernist theology professes to be able to do so, but as to how far it succeeds will be a matter for consideration. But the point about the questions I have asked is, I think, a disclosure of the need for presenting Christ in terms intelligible to the modern mind, and in terms comprehensive enough to grip both the man in the pew and the university student.

(1) and (2) show that Incarnation means nothing to these people, or that they reject it. (3) reveals a desire to understand Christ, to make Him more real, to link Him up with the rest of us. And if this desire were universal, it would favour an interpretation along the lines of Inspiration. Can this be done?

Let us realize that Christ was truly human. Reflect how 'the main stress of the argument of the Epistle to the Hebrews falls on the genuinely human experience by which Jesus became qualified to be the High Priest of humanity. . . . The Epistle to the Hebrews, in spite of the antiquarian form of its thought and phraseology, is perhaps the most human and the most "modern" of all the books of the New Testament' (Dr. Bethune-Baker in *The Faith of the Apostles' Creed*, p. 72). Christ was human in His emotions, human in His mental and physical growth, and shared the characteristic thought-forms of His day. When He spoke of disease, He spoke of it in terms of current demonology. When He quoted from the Psalms, He shared the views of His contemporaries as to their authorship. All of which we should expect if He was naturally and truly human.

We read that 'he increased in wisdom,' which means that He learned as we learn. He learned God's purpose for Himself, and nothing could make Him faithless to it, though the temptation to use His gifts for His own ends must have been very great. We ought to realize that His temptations were real just as ours are real. 'He who falls into sin gives way and yields before he has felt the full force of the temptation' (*op. cit.*, 86). Christ never yielded to sin, and therefore He was capable of feeling the full force of temptation. The same truth may be expressed by saying that, the holier the man, the harder the temptation. This, I believe, is capable of psychological verification. 'It is only in so far as we are good in our dominant psychology that we can be tempted to evil,' writes Dr. Hadfield (*Psychology and Morals*, 38). To the perfectly bad man, temptation would be meaningless. The temptation, then, of the perfectly good man must be in proportion to the perfection of his goodness. Christ fought the battle with our weapons, and won the victory under our drawbacks. He fought a real battle and won a real victory, and the secret of His success was His absolutely undeviating fellowship with the Father.

Now the point of our inquiry is, Will Inspiration account for His moral and spiritual successes? Will it explain the sublime Truth of His teaching? Will it explain His extraordinary and staggering insight into the very heart of Reality? Further, will it explain His claim to authority, and the consciousness of the uniqueness of His mission? Also, will it explain His miracles?

With the exception of the last question, most Modernists would answer in the affirmative. But they would hesitate on the subject of miracle. They would probably rule the problem out of court by *à priori* considerations, which are not easily harmonized with established canons of historical and literary criticism. The phenomena of the life of Jesus, they would maintain, are explicable in terms of Inspiration. The Spirit of God had unimpeded access through Him. His life was a channel in which there were no blockades, and therefore it is a real example to us, for what He did in the power of the Spirit we can do likewise. He has shown us the way, and all we have to do is to follow in His footsteps.

If it be asked, why did Christ have this perfect fellowship with God, and why was His life so perfect a channel for the operation of the Spirit? the answer is, because His response to the Spirit was perfect, *i.e.* whole-hearted, undivided, and disinterested. This sounds very straightforward and very simple, but it demands a further question. How do you explain the fact that this man of all men should have been enabled to make this perfect response to the Spirit of God? Is there not an element of uniqueness in the situation which is left unexplained? It is in its failure to account for the uniqueness of Christ that the theory of Inspiration, by itself, breaks down. Supposing that you argue, on the inspirational hypothesis, that God arranged or purposed that this one man, of all others, should make this perfect and unique response to God. We may well believe that God does arrange and purpose things. But to say that God arranged or purposed that this one Man among men should commune with Him as no other man ever did or probably ever will; should go through life, tempted as we are, yet never committing sin; should feel that He was God's instrument for the redemption of the world, without posterity charging Him with insanity; should make claims that no man ever did;—to say that God arranged or purposed this, though not in itself an impossibility, makes too great demands altogether on our faith. Besides, it does not bring Christ any nearer to us. He still remains a unique phenomenon, and, as such, He cannot be our example.

Christ was unique. 'In His case, as in no other, the Divine "personality" expressed itself through a human "personality": the human personality was the personality of God under the conditions of human life' (Bethune-Baker, *op. cit.*, p. 94).

It is in its failure to account for the uniqueness of Christ that Inspiration, as a theory complete in itself, breaks down. What is demanded is some explanation which will provide for this perfect response to the Spirit, issuing in a really human life. It is the contention of the writer that such explanation can alone be found in an act of God which must be for ever unique, *i.e.* Incarnation. It is true that Christ was a real man living a real human life, but this needs to be supplemented by the further statement, that He who lived this life was God under the conditions of human life. Such a being, ex-hypothesi, must be unique. And keeping this in mind, we may understand, even though we may not explain, why it is that Christ 'has shown Himself to be an abiding power in the world, an active spiritual force comparable with no other: and why it is that He was able to reveal God as none other had been able.' We shall understand the unique claims He made on men's loyalty and allegiance to Himself, and so we shall come to a real and living faith in His Lordship and Godhead. 'We never need to raise the question, "How can these things be?" When it is raised, the true answer is, "Come and see," or "Follow thou Me,"' (*op. cit.*, p. 80).

It is not suggested that the conclusion we have reached rules out the value of the theory of Inspiration. It is important, if we are to make Christ real to our age, that we should seek for an explanation of the Godhead of Jesus along the lines of Inspiration, provided we postulate Incarnation. But it *is* suggested that the difference which must for ever differentiate Him from us, can only be explained in terms of Incarnation. And we may thank God for the difference, for therein lies the assurance to that Life which is Life indeed.

Finally, is Christ our example? It is important to consider what we mean by example. Consider two men each endowed with similar qualities. The one, by a faithful use of those qualities, makes a success of his life, while the other, by abuse, makes a wreck of his life. If somebody should speak to the latter, and urge him to follow the example of the former, then in such a connexion, the word 'example' is legitimately used. Given similar endowments and equal opportunities, then the word has meaning. But when endowments in men differ, as is the case, and opportunities vary, how much meaning has the word then? I might advise a budding young playwright to copy the example of Shakespeare and write another *Hamlet*, but he might aptly reply, that such advice, far from being encouraging, is only embarrassing. He is conscious, at once, that there is a great difference between Shakespeare and himself. Shakespeare was gifted with massive genius: he is not. But, on the other hand, there is a sense in which the advice might well be helpful. It might drive him to study the plays of Shakespeare, their structure, arrangement, and plot. And much good might accrue from such a study. Shakespeare, he will find, can be a real example to him in many ways. He can learn that the secret of a play that is to live, is the faithfulness with which it portrays emotions, and, still more, the skill with which it interprets them. He can learn a thousand other things. Indeed, before he has finished learning, he will be convinced that Shakespeare is to him a real example. This does not imply that he will ever write another *Hamlet*. It does imply that *Hamlet* will inspire him to produce a play to the very best of his abilities. I think that in some such sense as this Christ is our example. A man may never reach the level of Jesus. But the level of Jesus can and will inspire him to reach heights otherwise unattainable.

Recent Foreign Theology.

Old Testament Problems.

THERE is no Old Testament problem on which dogmatism is more unseemly than that of the Decalogue, which has been assigned by equally competent scholars to practically every period between Moses and the early post-exilic age. Professor Ludwig Köhler has given an admirable conspectus [1] of the present position of the discussion, setting forth briefly but pointedly the nature of the problems raised, for example, by the alleged relation of the Sabbath to the phases of the moon, by the presence of commands in a series of prohibitions, by the fact that only one sacred cult-day is recognized by the Decalogue, etc. As against Mowinckel, he maintains that an analysis of the sources of the documents in which the two versions of the Decalogue are now embedded gives us really no clue to its date; while upon those who plead for a Mosaic origin he urges the wholesome reminder that the utmost they can claim is that the Decalogue *may*, but not that it *must*, have come from Moses.

To the lively discussion which has gathered in recent years round the Deuteronomic problem, Dr. A. R. Siebens has made a highly lucid and valuable contribution,[2] which takes into careful account the views of Kennett, Hölscher, Horst, Bentzen, Oestreicher, Schmidt, Welch, and others. Dr. Siebens maintains that of all the theories of Deuteronomy that of the school of de Wette-Graf-Wellhausen is, in its broad lines, still the most plausible: the book discovered by Hilkiah must have been some form of Deuteronomy, it had some connection with the reformation of Josiah, and its object was the centralization of the worship at Jerusalem. He makes certain modifications, however, on the prevailing critical theory; he admits that the reforms extended over a longer period than is commonly allowed for, that some were inaugurated before the eighteenth year of Josiah, that while some of the laws were the cause, others were the consequence of the reform, and that the (civil) laws in chs. 19–25 had not the same origin as the religious laws in 12–18. The book, which on its humanitarian side summarizes the teaching of the great prophets of the eighth century, lies somewhere between Hezekiah and 621, probably in the first twenty years of the seventh century. He accepts as authentic the reformation of Hezekiah as described in 2 K 18⁴, connecting it skilfully with the history of the period, and he offers some useful remarks on *waw* with the pf. for the consideration of scholars who propose to disintegrate 2 K 23 on the basis of the occasional emergence of that construction. He has little faith in the theory that Deuteronomy appeared in different editions; in any case there are no sufficient criteria for their discrimination. The book, written obviously by one who has the whole immense literature on Deuteronomy at his finger-ends, makes delightful reading: it is a thoroughly able defence of the commonly accepted view of the origin and purpose of Deuteronomy against the attacks which have recently been hurled at it from opposite flanks.

In the *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* [3] Eichrodt discusses the question whether O.T. theology has still an independent significance within O.T. science, and Morgenstern deals with the Matriarchate in ancient Israel and its historical implications. H. Hommel, pointing out the striking similarity between Ps 139 and the Vedic hymn (Atharvaveda iv. 16), raises the question whether, in view of the sparse emphasis upon the omnipresence of God in the O.T., the psalm may not be in some way dependent on the hymn. Galling throws light upon ancient worship by treating certain psalms and other brief sections of the O.T. as liturgical confessions of innocence made by the worshipper before being admitted to participation in the rites. Dr. Welch submits Neh 9 to an acute analysis, and concludes that 'the chapter has preserved a litany written for the worship of Northern Israel, on the occasion of a day of fasting, confession, and prayer.' The adoption of this litany by the men of Judah raises questions of the relation of the South to the North and questions about the composition of Ezr.-Neh. on which we hope Dr. Welch will in the near future throw some much needed light.

JOHN E. MCFADYEN.

Glasgow.

---

[1] In a *Separatabdruck* of the *Theologische Rundschau* (Mohr, Tübingen).

[2] *L'Origine du Code Deuteronomique,* Examen historique et littéraire du sujet à la lumière de la critique contemporaine, par Dr. Arthur-Robert Siebens (Librairie Ernest Leroux, 28 Rue Bonaparte, Paris; 25 francs).

[3] 1929—Heft 2 (Töpelmann, Giessen; Mk.4.50).

Contributions and Comments.

An Emendation to 1 Peter i. 13.

The text of the First Epistle of Peter has always had an attraction for me, ever since I discovered that it was far from being an exact transmission of what the first author wrote or dictated, and that its pages were frequently subject to discoloration to which one must apply the reagent of common sense, or the ultra-violet rays of insight. It may, therefore, be hoped that many monstrosities of transmission, to which have been attached a similar series of monstrosities of exposition, will ultimately be removed from the view of serious criticism, and reserved only for the lumber-room of the theological antiquary. In this direction of study every little that is an improvement is to be welcomed, and I find that the margins of the successive copies of the New Testament which I wear out are often decorated with *emendanda*, not always intended for publication, and only referred to at this point incidentally in order to suggest, to those who suspect the wisdom of a corrector, that the rule of Horace is often followed according to which certain results of inquiry and certain products of the imagination are to be kept in cold storage for nine years at the very least.

Well, here is a tiny correction to a passage which advises us to 'gird up the loins of our contemplative mind, to be wide awake and to hope perfectly for the grace that is to come our way in the revelation of Jesus Christ.'

The 'contemplative mind' or διάνοια is the connecting link with the διενοοῦντο of the previous passage, where I restored it from the Greek text of the *Book of Enoch*, where Enoch says that he 'contemplated' certain truths and visions, by a prevision for those who were to come after him. The correction was obvious when made, and does not need to be reargued at this point: but perhaps it may be said in passing that the associated language about searching 'what or what manner of time' the Spirit was intimating requires the addition of a second εἰς in the Greek, so as to read

εἰς τίνα ἢ εἰς ποῖον καιρόν·

We can then translate it

> 'Inquiring what *person* or what period was implied by the Spirit,' etc.

Coming now to the point at which we were first aiming, when we took up the corrector's pen, not meaning to use it as a field-marshal's baton, but only as the gentlest of directing wands, what does the writer mean by

νήφοντες τελείως ἐλπίσατε,

whether we take the first word in detachment or isolate the last? What is 'perfect sobriety' or what is 'perfect hope'? The language in either case is unnatural. Suppose we write it in uncial characters and then proceed to emendation. We have

ΝΗΦΟΝΤΕϹ ΤΕΛΕΙΩϹ ΕΛΠΙϹΑΤΕ,

which we transcribe as νήφοντές τε ἀεὶ, ἐλπίσατε substituting τε ἀεί for τελει. Then the following ὡς is *de trop* and may be omitted. The injunction was 'to keep wide awake *at all times*,' where the increase in the intelligibility of the passage may be held to compensate for the extrusion of two superfluous characters. We may now compare 2 Ti 4^5.

J. Rendel Harris.

Birmingham.

John i. 41.

In your review (May 1929, p. 349) of Dr. Bernard's Commentary on St. John, regarding the reading πρωί instead of πρῶτον or πρῶτος in 1^{41}, your reviewer says that πρωί 'has the support only of one or two old Latin MSS', overlooking the fact that this is also the reading of the Sinaitic Syriac. Mrs. Lewis (in her *Light on the Four Gospels from the Sinai Palimpsest*, p. 138 ff.), noting the two Old Latin MSS *b* and *e*, with their *mane*, says that Dr. Nestle advised her in this connexion to consult the Old Latin Codex Usserianus, r_1. Unfortunately the first syllable of every line had disappeared, but before 'fratem suum' stands printed the letter 'e' showing that the missing word was *mane* and not *primum*. (Even that 'e' is now lost from the original MS., but Dr. Abbott is certain it *was* there.) Dr. Wilkins pointed out to Mrs. Lewis that a parallel is found in the *Odyssey* (xxiv. 28) where πρωί has been restored instead of πρῶτα by Kayser, Ameio, La Roche, Faesi, and Munro. In Jn 1^{41} πρωί illustrates the dictum *difficilior lectio potior*. Moffatt adopts it in his translation and adds this footnote, 'The Greek word (πρωί) has been misread in nearly all the MSS for "first" (πρῶτον),' and refers to Mrs. Lewis's *Old Syriac Gospels*. Therefore there is perhaps more to be said in favour of πρωί than is indicated by your reviewer's possibly (may I say ?) somewhat inadequate remark.

Donald, Bishop of Bendigo.

Australia.

1 Peter iii. 18 f.

Taking this passage as it stands, without any attempt at textual emendation or forced exegesis, it states that, in the belief of the writer, our Lord, after His death and apart from His earthly body, visited certain beings who are described as spirits in prison, and made some announcement to them. Neither the matter of this *kerugma* nor its result is told us. But these spirits are identified with disobedient ones in the generation immediately preceding the Flood in the time of Noah. The mention of Noah and the Flood at once suggested the ark of safety and the instrumentality of water as destructive of the bad and preservative of the good. In this respect it resembled the water of baptism by which Christians are saved through the resurrection of Christ who is seated in heaven at God's right hand.

There is nothing in this passage parallel to the allusion in 4^{6}, which speaks of the gospel being preached to the dead. Nor does it lend any countenance to the weird mediæval imaginations of Christ's harrowing of hell, with all those concomitant phantasies depicted so often in religious art. Whatever the *kerugma* was, it was strictly limited to certain beings belonging to the immediate antediluvian age, and nothing is said as to the contents of the *kerugma* whether of good tidings or of denunciation.

Now, how do the vv.$^{19-21}$ fit into the context and help to enforce the writer's point ? He has been urging the duty of patience under suffering, arguing that suffering is the necessary condition of, and prelude to, glory. The supreme example of such passion followed by glorification was seen in Christ who bore silently every kind of indignity and was rewarded with Divine exaltation. This is a perfectly plain piece of teaching which is in no way illustrated or enforced by the assertion of some mission of Christ to a clearly limited and defined set of beings, whether wicked souls or fallen angels, of the antediluvian period. The irrelevance of this side-thought has struck most readers, and the commentators have exhausted their ingenuity in trying to justify it by reading into the words a great deal that they do not say or even hint at.

Now suppose we put brackets round vv.$^{19-21}$ and treat them as an interpolation. We then get a perfectly clear, uninterrupted, consistent, and coherent statement.

> 'Christ also suffered for sins once for all, . . . being put to death in the flesh, but quickened in the spirit, who is on the right hand of God, having gone into heaven.'

It seems fairly obvious that vv.$^{19-21}$ do not belong to this context at all, and that they must have been originally either a marginal note or an importation by displacement of a passage from another 'Petrine' writing. The primary source of the statement in v.^{19} is undoubtedly the Book of Enoch, where the story of the fallen angels is told and their incarceration described. Enoch was taken to see them, interceded for them, and was told to pronounce their doom. This easily detected reference has led some textual critics to the conjecture that ΕΝΩΚΑΙ (ἐν ᾧ καὶ) should be read as ἐν ᾧ Ἐνὼχ καὶ (ΕΝΩΕΝΩΧΚΑΙ), and this emendation may well be adopted provided that the whole of vv.$^{19-21}$ be removed from their present position, and regarded as an interpolation. Enoch was undoubtedly 'in the spirit' when he was conducted through the realms beyond this earth.

T. Herbert Bindley.

Denton.

Three Obscure O.T. Passages.

The additions to the literal text made by our translators are often really necessary to make the meaning clear to the English reader. But sometimes the translators favour a meaning that requires addition, when they might have been better to give a literal rendering. (1) Take, for instance, the last clause of Ps 37^{37} (A.V.), 'For the latter end of that man is peace.' Drop the word 'that,' which is not in the Hebrew, and the translation falls to pieces. The R.V. puts in the margin a literal rendering that might pass muster—'For there is a reward (*or* future *or* posterity) for the man of peace.' This, however, gives a feeling of irrelevancy, though even a soldier, if a good man, should be a man of peace, as the late Marshal Foch proved himself at the Armistice, when he might have gained a more spectacular victory by prolonging the war. But this is only by the way. Let us substitute 'sound man' for 'man of peace,' and we get what seems to me the natural rendering, and one which conveys a needed message for the times ; 'Mark the perfect man and behold the upright : for there is a future (*or* a reward) for the sound man' (*or* 'for the future is to the sound man').

(2) I was interested in a recent note on another verse of this kind, Pr 19[23]; and I would venture to offer a rendering of my own. V.[22] sets forth two independent axioms and so does v.[23] as it stands, and I would translate it thus: 'The fear of the Lord is unto life, or conduceth to life; and the satisfied man (*or* the contented man) taketh his rest at night (*or* passeth the night) undisturbed (*or* unvisited) by evil.' That is—'Godliness conduceth to life, and contentment to peaceful nights.'

(3) In the latter part of Ps 8[1] our translators follow ancient versions, as they seem to have regarded the Hebrew text as untranslatable. But is it really untranslatable? Should not *'ăshér* here be translated 'where,' coming, as it does, after 'in all the earth'? Then here is what we get: 'O Lord, our Lord, how excellent is thy name in all the earth! where set thou thy glory above the heavens (*or* where let thy glory reach above the heavens).' This is a prayer that the earth may be full of the glory of God and overflowing, and filling illimitable space above. The English and the Hebrew view the truth from different angles. The English depicts the glory of God as already shining in the heavens, and manifest on earth, without reference to its recognition. The Hebrew sees even now a measure of recognition in the earth, but longs for the grand consummation foretold in Nu 14[21], when the earth shall be filled with the glory of the Lord in such a manner that it cannot be withstood or gainsaid. V.[2] tends to favour this view, and the verses which come after are not necessarily opposed to it.

D. MUIR.

Morocco.

Sunday School Teaching and the Revised Version.

IN regard to the excellent article by the Rev. F. J. Rae, in the June issue, all who are acquainted with the facts of modern Sunday school life, and will honestly acknowledge them, must wish that such an appeal could, for the truth's sake, be circulated throughout the land. The importance of its suggestions cannot be overestimated. But the more strange, and indeed amazing, is the total absence of any reference to the Revised Version as being, for all teaching purposes, so much superior to the Version of 1611, usually, though wrongfully, known as the 'Authorized Version.' Of its merits as a supreme example of Elizabethan English, and the charm of its associated memories, there is no need to speak. But in the light of Mr. Rae's valuable article it is surely not enough to say that 'we want a well-printed Bible.' Still more, in these days, we need for our young people a reliably translated Bible, and in hundreds of cases, as Canon Driver publicly affirmed, the older Version is not such. In my recent volume on *Reality in Bible Reading*, published by Messrs. T. & T. Clark, I have definitely specified four hundred instances in which, if truth is to be taught, the older Version is misleading. It is not enough that the teacher should —sometimes—be acquainted with such new and helpful renderings as those of Dr. Moffatt, and, for the New Testament, which is confessedly the most important, Dr. Weymouth's Version, and the 'Twentieth-Century New Testament.' These will not be employed, however excellent, in Sunday school classes. But the Revised Version is easily procurable, and is surely, though slowly, finding its proper place in pulpits. But there are many reasons why it is still more urgently needed in all classes of young people, whether in Sunday or day schools. As a matter of simple fact, ALL the most popular quotations from the old Version are false renderings, and so convey a wrong impression. Surely it is waste of everything to persist in reading what is wrong, under the plea that the teacher can put it right.

FRANK BALLARD.

Sheffield.

'Time-Measures of the Pentateuch.'

MAY I be allowed to point out a serious defect in the Rev. A. T. Richardson's argument in his otherwise interesting and suggestive paper on 'Time-Measures of the Pentateuch' in your August number, just to hand in this Colony? It is true that the word *shānāh*, which is usually rendered in our version by 'year,' is 'actually almost the same as the Hebrew word for "two,"' but it is by no means correct that it 'properly denotes "that which repeats or recurs."' The two roots are essentially different. The similarity of the Hebrew pronunciation in the two cases was due to the very familiar defect recorded in the famous case of 'Shibboleth.' *Shānāh*, a year, stands for 'sana,' Arabic سنة. *Shnayim*, two, from which was derived the verb *shānāh*, to double, to fold, to repeat (not *vice versa*), stands for *thnayim*, Aramaic and Arabic *thnayin* (اثنين).

There is no case known in literature of a year of six months. It is true that the Israelites had an ecclesiastical year beginning with Abib about the vernal equinox, and a civil year beginning at Rosh ha-Shānāh in September or October. But both of them were full lunar years adjusted to the solar calendar. Geo. B. Michell.

Dominica, B.W.I.

In answer to Mr. G. B. Michell, I would quote Gesenius, *Hebrew Lexicon*, ‘שָׁנָה—pr. an iteration, sc. of the course of the sun, or of the changes of the seasons.’ Hebrew has the word פָנָה, but not, so far as I can find, שָׁנָה. Of course, Arabic was not in existence as a language in the times of the early Genesis records, and cannot be a certain guide, any more than modern English can guide us certainly in regard to old Saxon.

In his second paragraph, Mr. Michell begs the question at issue. The Pentateuch literature apparently provides the ‘case’ required. As I have pointed out, the month Abib is called the beginning of the *shanah*, and the Feast of Ingathering (about six months later) the end of the *shanah*.

Has Mr. Michell any evidence to produce which will prove that the civil and ecclesiastical years, with their different commencements, were in vogue in Mosaic times, or among nomads?

A. T. Richardson.

St. Boniface College, Warminster.

Entre Nous.

The Religious Motive in ‘The Bridge of San Luis Rey.’

Anatole France somewhere says that even the most admirable books seem to him infinitely less precious for what they contain than for what is read into them. There is, indeed, a kind of Divine receptivity about some books, a *releasing* quality. They serve as an outlet for trammelled spirits. Ever, as it were, in the lulls and hesitancies of the author’s scrupulous thinking, the reader may step in, and do what he can to assist. Such books are very endearing. Reviewers do not always speak well of them, but they find their way into the heart of the public and stay there. When *The Bridge of San Luis Rey*, by Mr. Thornton Wilder, was first published in October 1927, it was given a very mixed reception by the reviewers, but every one who read it talked about it to his friends. For while we all thirst to converse about elemental things, it remains the convention to discuss the latest novel. And when a new story deals with those large issues that haunt and mystify us all, it is usually very widely read.

This story begins excellently, with a masterly simplicity. ‘On Friday noon, July the 20th, 1714, the finest bridge in all Peru broke and precipitated five travellers into the gulf below. This bridge was on the high road between Lima and Cuzco, and hundreds of persons passed over it every day.’ There is your first glimpse of the situation, seen plainly and clearly enough, but still from the distance; you are interested, but not deeply moved. Then, while you still gaze towards the scene of the little tragedy, you see other figures hastening to and fro, confused, perturbed: the incident has affected them profoundly. ‘People wandered about in a trance-like state; muttering, they had the hallucination of seeing themselves falling into a gulf.’

You become more interested, you seem yourselves to be straying across the brilliant Peruvian landscape toward the river and the broken bridge. And now, since you have come so near the gulf, the author, freed from the tyrannies of mundane Time, allows you to see it all happen over again. This time a Franciscan missionary, Brother Juniper, is standing by your side. ‘A twanging noise filled the air, as when the string of some musical instrument snaps in a disused room, and he’—that is, Brother Juniper—‘saw the bridge divide and fling five gesticulating ants into the valley below.’ And now we can listen to this Franciscan’s thoughts, in the silence that follows on that twanging noise. ‘Why did this happen to *those* five?’ he asks himself. ‘If there were any plan in the universe at all, if there were any pattern in a human life, surely it could be discovered mysteriously latent in those lives so suddenly cut off. Either we live by accident and die by accident, or we live by plan and die by plan.’

At this point the author takes us indoors, as it were, and has a little confidential chat. For the next six years, he tells us, Brother Juniper devotes all his time to an inquiry into the lives of those five souls, in the effort to prove that each of them had at that moment received the finishing touch from the Potter’s Hand. Then at the end of those six years he and his manuscripts are publicly burned in the cathedral square. He has learned nothing, except that he himself is a heretic. Long after, another secret copy of his book is discovered, and by its aid, and as a result of the author's own inquiries and speculations, this little jewel of prose is cut and polished into five facets, each facet the life of one of the victims, seen, as Rachel Annand Taylor said in the *Spectator*, 'from a strange and enchanting angle.' But, even more than by the gem itself, we are held and charmed by the hand that polishes the gem. These pages reveal a spirit that is penetrating without dogmatism, delicate yet clear-cut in all its motions, powerful without being rude, exquisite without being great. 'For all his diligence,' he says, 'Brother Juniper never knew the central passion of Dona Marfa's life; nor of Uncle Pio's, nor even of Estaban's (these were three of the victims). *And I, who claim to know so much more, is it possible that even I have missed the very spring within the spring?*'

The Christian Church is much more dogmatic than its Founder with regard to the facts which lie beyond human consciousness. Dogmatism has become confused with orthodoxy. But if the moral perfection of Jesus imposed upon itself limits to its omniscience, as, for example, when He said: 'Of that day and that hour knoweth no man, no, not the angels which are in heaven, neither the Son . . .' then how narrow a horizon of knowledge dare we claim! Every moral failure dims our vision, and can Forgiveness, even if it will, restore what is lost? But what strikes us about Thornton Wilder is how extremely undogmatic, how singularly tentative, are the theories which he allows to emerge from his analysis of these lives. 'Some say we shall never know, and that to the gods we are like flies that the boys kill on a summer day, and some say, on the contrary, that the very sparrows do not lose a feather that has not been brushed away by the finger of God.' Somehow, we think that it is with these last that he agrees, however diffident his manner may be. For again, —perhaps in the most assured of all his sentences,— speaking of a famous actress and her old tutor, he says: 'Whom were these two seeking to please? Not the audiences of Lima. They had long since been satisfied. We come from a world where we have known incredible standards of excellence, and we dimly remember beauties which we have not seized again; and we go back to that world. Uncle Pio and Camila Perichole were tormenting themselves in an effort to establish in Peru the standards of the theatres in some Heaven whither Calderòn had preceded them. The public for which masterpieces are intended is not on this earth.' The man who wrote those words has found his own soul.

Faith, for Thornton Wilder, remains always a working hypothesis, and the conduct of faith, as implicitly asseverated in this curious tale, is a putting of that hypothesis, by every act and thought, to the test. The hypothesis is the only one which Time and History and the spirit of man have ever justified, the one which rears itself higher and higher, and establishes itself deeper and deeper, as the world grows older. It is the faith in a 'Love that moves the sun and every star.' It is this quality of Love that he finds shaping and dictating all things. He distinguishes it sharply from the lesser loves. 'She had never realized any love save love as passion. Such love, though it expend itself in generosity and thoughtfulness, though it give birth to visions and to great poetry, remains among the sharpest expressions of self-interest. Not until it has passed through a long servitude, through its own self-hatred, through mockery, through great doubts, can it take its place among the loyalties.' Another character, Uncle Pio, is further 'ben.' 'He divided the inhabitants of this world into two groups, into those who had loved, and those who had not. It was a horrible aristocracy, apparently, for those who had no capacity for love (or rather for suffering in love) could not be said to be alive, and certainly would not live again after their death. They were a kind of straw population, filling the world with their meaningless laughter and tears and chatter and disappearing still lovable and vain into thin air. For this distinction he cultivated his own definition of love that was like no other and that had gathered all its bitterness and pride from his odd life. He regarded love as a sort of cruel malady, through which the elect are required to pass in their late youth and from which they emerge, pale and wrung, but ready for the business of living.'

But in the final act of Love which draws the curtain on our mortality, a mystery must remain. That was where Brother Juniper went wrong. That is where some of the critics of this book have gone wrong. They think that for faith everything must be defined, and that Thornton Wilder has been much more definite than they are justified in thinking, and so they conjure up interpretations of his philosophy to suit their own fancy. Mr. Cyril Conolly, for example, refers to 'this theory of spiritual ruination preceding death, which is hence never untimely,' and he adds that the theory now adopted by Mr. Wilder was first put forward by Goethe. But if there is one thing about these untimely deaths that is made clear it is that in three instances at least these lives had broken afresh into blossom just then, and they were ready and courageous for a braver kind of living than ever before.

The Speaker's Bible.

St. Mark's Gospel has been covered in *The Speaker's Bible* in two volumes, and the second of these is now ready (Speaker's Bible Office, Aberdeen; 9s. 6d. net each). As *The Speaker's Bible* was begun and edited by Dr. Hastings and is now carried on by the editors of this magazine it is not our custom to insert anything in the nature of a review of it here. We have occasionally quoted the reviews of others, but the new volume is only just out so that none has appeared as yet, but here are estimates by the last two reviewers of the first volume: 'it is no exaggeration to say that *The Speaker's Bible* is the greatest thing of its kind in existence,' 'the splendid volumes of this famous series.'

The second volume of Mark deals with chapters ten to the end of the Gospel. Sermons, sometimes more than one, are given on forty texts, the most suggestive thought being chosen in each case, and points driven home and illustrated from the newest essays, poetry, fiction, and current events. A study on 'Influence' has been contributed by Dr. W. M. Grant, and one on 'Fruitlessness,' by the Rev. J. H. Morrison, M.A., while Professor Gossip writes on 'The Cry of Dereliction.' From this the following paragraph is quoted. Some years ago a subject index to the first volumes was prepared. As a large number of readers have spoken of the added value this has given to the series, a further index is included in the new volume.

Most envied?

'We are often told that Mark ends in the darkness with a beaten, disappointed Christ. It is not so, of course. Still, it is well other evangelists have gathered sayings from His lips upon the tree we could ill spare.

In John He dies with the shout of a Conqueror. And it is well for us to bear in mind that, as it seems, what lifted the depression from His spirit, was that the poor soul hanging there beside Him, awed by something in this strange convict suffering along with him, threw himself on His grace with a dim, inchoate, nebulous faith that was still faith where faith seemed utterly impossible. And it came like a reviving cup of water to our Lord's parched lips and soul. The thing was working then; and God was standing to His promises; and it was not in vain, but coming true. 'It is finished,' He cried; and gave back to God no broken hope, no failure, no mere gallantry of endeavour that had not succeeded, but a life lived out, and a tremendous task accomplished in the face of every hindrance. Let us remember that. Old Dr. Duncan used to say that of all living beings he most envied the angel who stood by our Lord in the loneliness of His agony in the garden. But why not rather this strange, uncouth, most unlikely comforter when things were darker still?'[1]

Lama sabachthani.

'Ezra,' of the *Methodist Recorder*, who never misses any good thing, had an interesting paragraph lately on the 'Untranslated Words of Jesus' in which he retells a story given by the late Dr. George H. Morrison in an address to children. Some years ago, he says, 'the late Dr. George H. Morrison met, in Glasgow, General Agha Petros, Commander-in-Chief of the Assyrian Forces during the World War, and had an interesting conversation with him, being most interested by the news that at his home, away up in the mountains behind Nineveh, they still speak the very language that the Lord spoke. Sometimes the children of General Petros, like other bairns, are a little unwilling to get up in a morning, and, if it happens to be one of the girls, his wife will go to the bedroom, and say, "Talitha cumi," which means, "Daughter, it's time to get up." Sometimes, again, when his children come home from school they find the house door shut, and if nobody comes immediately to open it they shout for admittance, and what they shout is a word very familiar to Gospel readers—"Ephphtha." "But," says Dr. Morrison, "I think the last thing he told us was even more interesting. He said this: 'Supposing my wife and I go out some afternoon, and we leave the family at home, and then, suppose we make more calls than we intended, and we are late in getting home. Of course, in this country the children would not mind in the least, but in that country they are never quite safe, and when the darkness comes the children get anxious, and so when I come to the door the children say, "Lama, sabachthani? Father, what has kept you, where have you been, why have you left us like this?"'"'

---

[1] A. J. Gossip, in *The Speaker's Bible*, 'Mark,' ii. 168.

Printed by Morrison & Gibb Limited, Tanfield Works,
and Published by T. & T. Clark, 38 George Street,
Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to The Editor, Kings
Gate, Aberdeen, Scotland.

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

Church union has been much before the public mind in recent years, and doubtless it will continue to be so in the years to come. But there is one aspect of it more comprehensive than any that is generally entertained by friendly Churches for one another. It is that aspect of it emphasized in the Epistle to the Ephesians, where the writer prays that his readers 'may be strong to apprehend *with all the saints* what is the breadth, and length, and height, and depth; and to know the love of Christ, which passeth knowledge.' That is his ambition for his converts; the goal is that they 'may be filled unto all the fulness of God'; but the achievement of that ambition demands nothing less than all the spiritual force available. It can be accomplished, but only 'with *all* the saints.' Comprehensive beyond the dream of all but the most daring Churchmen would be a Church which included all the saints.

Most of us are not quite at our ease when we meet the word 'saints.' We feel that that high title is not for us, and we modestly prefer to associate it with the great figures of the Church who have exhibited the Christian virtues and graces and pieties in pre-eminent degree—St. John, St. Paul, St. Augustine, and many another whose light has burned and shone in the dark places of history. But in the New Testament the word simply designates the ordinary, inconspicuous members of Christ's Church, set apart and consecrated to the holy life involved in their relation to Christ; and the fundamental Church union, without which the larger unions will be robbed of more than half their vitality, is the brotherly union of the members of a local congregation with one another in their endeavour to apprehend the love of Christ and to cherish the things that are lovely and of good report.

These, however, are but a fraction of a mighty multitude which no man can number. We speak of the Holy Catholic Church. But of the Churches which call themselves Catholic, what can compare in catholicity with that which includes *all* the saints, and which places at the disposal of every tempted and struggling soul, for her guidance and inspiration, all the wise thoughts with which they have ever been visited, all the heroic endurance, even unto death, with which they have sealed their testimony, all their love, hope, faith, joy, triumph, all their vision of eternal things unseen?

All that glorious heritage is ours, and yet how little we know of it, how little we have entered into it, how little we have tried or even desired to enter into it! It is ours, and yet it is not ours, for most of us make little or no effort to appropriate it. Few of us know as much as we might of the saints whose heroic and brilliant story fills the pages of the history of our own Church, and we know still less of the saints of other Churches and other communions. But the true Christian fellowship knows no denominational distinctions; it includes all who aspire 'to apprehend the breadth, and length, and height, and depth.'

No Church has a monopoly of piety or wisdom. Each has something to learn from every other. In ecclesiastical, as in other spheres, God fulfils Himself in many ways, and He has something to say to us through the saints and the methods of every communion. The European Churches in the meantime have much to teach the Asiatic Churches, but the time is perhaps not far distant when they will have something to learn from them. We are debtors unto all the saints—to those with whom we agree, and also to those from whom we differ. The more we know of the fellowship of the saints, the richer and the fuller will our own life be.

It becomes us then to enter speedily into communion with those about whose saintship there can be no dispute. And surely in this regard must come first of all the saints who wrote the Bible and who poured into it their experience of the love and the leading of God. But how often do we suffer our stifled souls to be revived in the ampler air of the Evangelists? Yet the Gospels and even the Epistles are far better known than the prophets. To many Christian people, are not Amos and Hosea little more than names? The Bible is crowded with the lives and the words of the saints, in whose fellowship, if we but cared to cultivate it daily, our lives might be clothed with undreamt-of nobility and power.

But all through the Church's history, from the first century to the twentieth, she has never been without her saintly witnesses; and our life will be the richer when we know the story of their struggles. Our fortitude will be encouraged by the sight of their fidelity, our wisdom will be matured by the study of their meditations. We should therefore be at more pains to acquaint ourselves with the biography of Christ's mighty men—Savonarola, Luther, Knox, Bunyan, the Wesleys, Newman, and many a score of others. 'Have ye not read?' said Jesus. Reading is one way of increasing our spiritual stature. Especially perhaps the reading of biography—'have ye not read *what David did*?' It might even be plausibly urged that the reading of biography is a Christian duty; it is at any rate an incomparable privilege—a means of grace and growth.

Every hymn-book is a testimony to our indebtedness to the saints. There we meet sweet singers of every communion. We sing 'Lead, kindly light, amid the encircling gloom,' 'My God, how wonderful Thou art!' 'Hark! the herald angels sing,' 'O Love Divine, how sweet Thou art!'—we sing these and a hundred other great hymns of the Church without asking or caring whether they came from monk or bishop or minister. In their harmonious songs of praise all petty discords die. As we sing those hymns we step into that shining fellowship from which no power can excommunicate us but our own little-mindedness and sin.

In a paper on the philosophical approach to religion, given at the recent Cambridge Congregational Conference, Professor Sorley said, 'Mathematics and mathematical physics again occupy the centre of the stage, as they did in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, and their equations can be understood only by the highly trained mathematician. It would have been a good thing for the philosophers of the present day if they had been compelled to pass a qualifying examination in the higher mathematics before completing their professional curriculum. As it is, the non-mathematical philosopher has to accept many results which he understands only imperfectly and many reasonings which he does not understand at all. He has to move warily, but he is helped by the philosophers who have come from the ranks of the mathematicians themselves; and they have brought into prominence certain results of the new science which are conspicuously significant for philosophy.'

Realizing, as we have all begun to do, the profound bearing that the new physics is likely to have upon philosophy and theology, we welcome every competent attempt to elucidate its meaning and help us to assign to it its due place in the realm of thought. In the current number of *The Hibbert Journal* there is an acute criticism of the New Realism as expounded by Professor Alexander in his book on 'Space, Time, and Deity.' Professor Alexander's name for the New Realism is 'Empirical Metaphysics.' He limits experience to sense-experience, and therefore starts from the assumption that the physical world is 'the Universe.' Experience somehow guarantees its own reality independently of mind, which itself is only a bit of sense-experience. 'The effect of the empirical method in metaphysics is severely and persistently to treat finite minds as one among the many forms of finite existence having no privilege among them except such as it derives from its greater perfection of development.' In these words Professor Alexander emphatically rules out 'mind as an entity superior both to things and to passing states.' It is not the object of sense-experience, therefore it does not exist.

What, then, is the ultimate reality? It is Space-Time. 'Space-Time is the stuff of which matter and all things are specifications.' Here we may ask, 'If sense-experience is the guarantee of reality, what experience have we of Space-Time?' We have experience of space as emptiness, and of time as duration, but of Space-Time as an indissoluble and all-embracing whole, of Space-Time as the one stuff of which all things are made, we have no experience whatever. Professor Alexander, in endeavouring to elucidate the matter, describes Space-Time variously as 'the primary reality,' 'the bare elements of the world,' 'the totality of all substances.' Thus, as the critic in *The Hibbert Journal* justly remarks, 'Space-Time is on the one hand the universe in its lowest expression and on the other hand the universe in its totality. It is Alpha from one point of view, and Alpha and Omega from another.' But this confusion of thought was perhaps inevitable. For if the universe in its lowest expression is self-existent and intrinsically real, and if there is no gradation in reality, then, however much the universe may gain in complexity, it will never really rise above the level of its own lowest expression. It was Space-Time in the beginning of things, and it will be no more than Space-Time at the end.

The next question to be faced is, 'How does the primary reality Space-Time succeed in differentiating itself?' Here Professor Alexander is driven back on metaphors which he uses somewhat vaguely and with little regard to their original meaning. Space-Time is the *matrix* out of which all things come, or the *stuff* from which all things are made. Taking the metaphor of a matrix or womb we may ask, 'How did the empty womb of Space-Time become full of possible existents, and how came they to be fertilized and born?' Taking the metaphor of stuff or raw material we may ask, 'By what power is the raw material worked up, and how can it be at once the endless variety of finished articles and yet remain the primary stuff?'

The term used to cover the process—a term which appears to be gaining a wide popularity—is 'emergence.' Matter is, at some unknown point and in some unknown way, an 'emergent' from Space-Time. Life is similarly an 'emergent' from matter, and mind an 'emergent' from life. There is here a succession of unexplained and unintelligible jumps, from Space-Time to matter, from matter to life, from life to mind. Take the first jump. The bodies of the physical world are not pieces of Space-Time, but pieces of something very different, namely, matter or mass. The space occupied by a body is no criterion of its mass. In other words, there is no fundamental connexion between the space occupied even by an atom and its massiveness, so that there is no transition from the mere conception of space to that of matter and its exchanges of energy. The transitions from matter to life and from life to mind are equally abrupt and unintelligible. As Professor Haldane has remarked in criticism of this theory of emergent evolution, 'It seems to me that Alexander produces the real world very much as a conjurer produces rabbits out of a hat. The rabbits are real enough, and not shams; but in reality they were there from the beginning. Newtonian matter was there from the beginning if it is there now. Life was also there from the beginning if it is there now. Equally without beginning are the interest and values of conscious behaviour.' In other words, the ultimate source of all things must transcend the highest height to which the evolution has risen; it must have contained from the first all that has ever emerged.

The weakness of the New Realism, as expounded by Professor ALEXANDER, is its depreciation of Mind. It seeks reality at the lower end of the scale rather than the upper. This amounts to a subversion of the due order of things and encourages a tendency to express the higher in terms of the lower. 'As we follow the world in its ascent from the first beginnings of things to the present stage of its development, we shall find that there is a constant tendency for each stage in turn to drag the stage next above it down to its own level, and to sink to the level of the stage next below it.' From this depreciation of mind there are, of course, eminent physicists who vigorously dissent. Eddington, for example, says, 'I know that I think with a certainty which I cannot attribute to any of my physical knowledge of the world.' And again, 'Mind is the first and most direct thing in our experience, and all else is remote inference.' Along this road he and others find the most direct avenue of approach to the ultimate reality. 'Order,' says Professor Sorley, 'is the result of intelligence on the human level; and the greater order on the cosmic scale reveals an intelligence adequate to it. That, or else what we call chance. And the newer knowledge has so increased the complexity of the elements brought into order that the probabilities against the production of the world by a fortuitous concourse of atoms have been enormously increased. Three centuries ago Francis Bacon used the memorable words, "I had rather believe all the fables in the Legend, and the Talmud, and the Alcoran, than that this universal frame is without a mind." I do not know what reasons there are (if any) which could induce a reasonable man to believe the fables in the Legend, and the Talmud, and the Alcoran, but I am convinced, in spite of the disagreement of many philosophers of the day, that there is, if possible, even more reason now than there was three hundred years ago to reject the view that "this universal frame is without a mind."'

'The Heathen Heart,' by the Rev. Campbell MOODY, D.D., attracted considerable attention when it was published some years ago. Dr. MOODY has followed that book (and others) by *The Purpose of Jesus in the First Three Gospels*, which contains the Bruce Lectures for 1929 (Allen & Unwin; 5s. net). It shows the independence and clear vision which we have been led to expect from this writer. It raises big questions, indeed the biggest question of all, and seeks to bring us back to realities that in recent times have been largely evaded.

Dr. MOODY is dissatisfied with the way in which the gospel facts have been handled by writers on the New Testament in our time. The things that stare us in the face in the Gospels have been whittled down or ignored until Jesus has become a figure of no special significance. The whole trend of recent criticism has been to represent Jesus as a religious leader with a great message, not about Himself but about God. His purpose was to reveal God as Father, and there His significance ends. Dr. MOODY denies this. It was not the purpose even of His public preaching. It was still less the purpose of His individual dealing.

One of the outstanding facts of the gospel narrative is the urgency of Christ's claims for Himself. Is it possible to account for this 'awful urgency' if His complete gospel was summed up in the 'Prodigal Son'? Is it possible to account for this urgency, or to justify it, if His chief or perhaps His sole aim was to make known the love of the Father? Prophets and psalmists had revealed God's love to men. To receive their revelation it was quite needless to own any allegiance to them. Jesus as the Revealer of the Father is, indeed, an enticing picture, and it is true as far as it goes. But, taken alone, it does not present the Jesus of the Gospels. For, in the Gospels, His chief purpose is to draw men to Himself as the sole means of entrance to God's Kingdom, the sole means of approach to God.

And He implies, in one or two of His utterances, that He cannot, or will not, make a *real* revelation of the Father except to those who have joined themselves to Him.

This may be regarded as the central theme of the book. And Dr. Moody proceeds, in a remarkable chapter on 'The Word of the Cross,' to carry it to the centre. The purpose of Jesus was to present Himself as a *Saviour*. The treatment of the death of Jesus is the best and most moving part of the book. It may be described as a vindication of the orthodox belief about the Cross. Dr. Moody puts aside, with a few incisive but adequate words, some current interpretations. The death of Jesus, for example, was not merely the inevitable conclusion of His life. Again, Jesus did not go up to Jerusalem to offer Himself as Messiah, hoping that the people would receive Him.

Nor did Jesus go to meet death with the idea of moving the hearts of men by His sufferings. He does not speak, as we so often do, of winning men by love. As a matter of fact, what Jesus in the Gospels most insists upon is that His suffering is a necessity. Suffering and death are a cup handed to Him, a baptism awaiting Him. We are at once struck with the overwhelming importance of this event in His own mind. It is something to which He looked forward with mingled dread and expectancy. Was it from His study of Isaiah that our Lord learned a doctrine repugnant to the common understanding, the necessity of dying in order to reign? Is it not much more likely that the terrible truth, so unwelcome to flesh and blood, was directly revealed by the Father, and then confirmed by a study of Scripture? In any case, the disclosure appears to have come to Him at a very early date. The Temptation that followed the Baptism is much more comprehensible if we suppose that already a path of suffering lay before the eye of Jesus.

If Jesus regarded Himself as the Servant we need not discuss the authenticity of such words as 'The Son of man came to give his life a ransom in the place of many.' How could He keep from saying this? He must have thought it a hundred times. What it means, at the very least, is that Christ's death takes the place of the death of many; and the natural interpretation is that the death of an innocent One exempts the guilty. Why do so many theologians and interpreters admit this grudgingly, or deny it altogether? Surely it was Christ's meaning. Better to be frank, and admit Him wrong, than subtle, and explain Him away. Dr. Moody points out that the truth of the 'ransom' saying is confirmed by the saying at the Lord's Supper, 'this is my blood of the covenant.' It was a covenant between God and man in the blood of Jesus.

Then follows what is the most interesting passage in the exposition, a justification of traditional beliefs about the death of Christ, particularly two: that which regards Jesus as a Substitute for the sinner, and that which lays emphasis on the justice of God. Dr. Moody contends that biological and social science, as well as philosophy, has shattered the old assurance that each individual stands alone. They have made the old idea of substitution intellectually credible. He then proceeds boldly to vindicate the idea on moral grounds. Mentioning actual instances in which men have taken the place of others, he says that they arouse in us nothing but admiration and reverence. And if it be said that one may not be *punished* in another's stead, he demurs, and quotes in support Dr. Dods's question, 'In what intelligible sense can sins be borne but by bearing their punishment?'

The final stage of this absorbing discussion is a vindication of the conception of God as Judge. The God who is presented to us in much Christian thinking to-day is not a real Being, Dr. Moody contends. The God who is love and only love, has a nature more limited than ours. When we are at our best, injustice and cruelty fill us with anger, and this anger is not a form of love! Just as little is the wrath of God to be belittled or apologized for. Indeed, the God who is imagined in much of our modern literature is not the God of either Old or New Testament; and just as little is He the God of reason, or of experience. If we exclude judgment and wrath from the nature of God, we do not bring Him near. We put Him far away. He is no more the Living God. Dr. Moody brings all this to a pointed conclusion when he says that, though mystery may remain in the death of Christ, yet the mystery is abated if we recognize that by His own will, and by the Father's appointment, the innocent did, in some sense, take the place of the guilty. May God forbid that for us Jesus should cease to be a Saviour!

The Language of the Pentateuch in its Relation to Egyptian.

By Professor John E. McFadyen, D.D., Glasgow.

Professor A. S. Yahuda has just published an elaborate volume of 320 large and beautifully printed pages, bearing the title *Die Sprache des Pentateuch in ihren Beziehungen zum Aegyptischen* (Walter de Gruyter & Co., Berlin, W.10; Mk.22). Only an accomplished Egyptologist could do justice to this impressive book; but even Old Testament scholars who are not Egyptologists will recognize it at once as a contribution of first-rate importance to Old Testament science. As this volume is to be followed by another which will deal with the portions of the Pentateuch not here discussed, any criticism of the argument which it introduces must be premature and incomplete; but the trend of the conclusion is already quite visible. Briefly it is this, that the Pentateuch originated about the time of the Exodus and before the conquest of Canaan. Hebrew, it is argued, was developed from a primitive Canaanite dialect, under the influence of Egyptian, into the literary language which we find in the Pentateuch: so pervasive is its Egyptian colouring, alike in language and style, that it could only have originated in an Egyptian environment. Thus the argument of the book, as its title suggests, is mainly, though not exclusively, linguistic. There are words and turns of expression, it is contended, which occur in no other Semitic language, but are to be found in the Pentateuch and in Egyptian; and similarly, words which within the Bible appear only in the Pentateuch, but also in Egyptian. Of course Egyptian words in the Pentateuch, like אָחוּ, *reeds* (Gn $41^{2, 18}$), have long been recognized as such, but Dr. Yahuda believes that other words, which have passed for Semitic, are really Egyptian: *e.g.* חַרְטֻמִּים, *magicians*, which the *Oxford Lexicon* connects with חֶרֶט, 'stylus,' is explained as derived from the Egyptian *ḥrj* and *ḏm* and meaning 'those who are over the books,' *i.e.* 'learned in the (magical) writings.' So תּוֹעֵבָה, *abomination*, for which the *Oxford Lexicon* assumes a root תעב, is held to be connected with the Egyptian *wʿb* (ועב), 'pure, holy,' and it should in strictness be referred in Hebrew dictionaries to יעב. (The transformation of the meaning would be explained by the simple fact that what was holy to the Egyptians would be an abomination to the Hebrews.) Similarly כֵּן, *post, place* (*office*) (Gn 40^{13} 41^{13}), is believed to have nothing to do with the Hebrew כּוּן, but comes from the Egyptian *gnw*, 'a stand.' Again שֶׁבֶר, *corn, grain*, which looks so genuinely Hebrew, is the Eg. *šbw*, 'food'; and the puzzling חֲמֻשִׁים (*Oxf. Lex.* 'in battle array,' Ex 13^{18}, Jos 1^{14} 4^{12}, Jg 7^{11}) is connected with the Egyptian *ẖmś* ('lance, harpoon') and explained to mean 'armed with lances.' It is certainly not without significance that no less than four Egyptian words appear in a single verse (Ex 2^{3})—תֵּבָה (ark), גֹּמֶא (rushes), סוּף (reeds), and יְאֹר (river).

The first and shorter section of the book deals with the Joseph and Exodus narratives, which reflect most distinctly the Egyptian environment, and exhibit most clearly a linguistic relation with Egyptian. The second and in some ways the more important and interesting section deals with the Genesis stories in 1–11, in which the Babylonian element has long been recognized, and with the patriarchal stories. The first section offers a detailed examination of certain words and phrases which can only be explained, or at least can best be explained, on the basis of Egyptian analogies. Here are some illustrations. The difficult עַל־פִּיךָ יִשַּׁק (Gn 41^{40}: according to thy word 'shall they be ruled,' R.V.) whose text the *Oxford Lexicon* suspects as corrupt—for נשק regularly means 'to kiss'—is explained, in accordance with Egyptian metaphorical usage, as meaning 'shall feed,' the reference being to Joseph's measures for the regulation of Egypt's food supply. The infinitive in an imperatival sense (נָתוֹן, Gn 41^{43}; cf. 43^{16}) is an Egyptian construction familiar in official proclamations and laws; cf. the inf. in both versions of the fourth commandment (זָכוֹר, Ex 20^{8}; שָׁמוֹר, Dt 5^{12}). Those who 'stood by' Joseph (Gn 45^{1}) are not casual bystanders, but officers of the court—a regular Egyptian phrase. In Ex 9^{16} the curious word 'for this cause *have I made thee to stand*' (הֶעֱמַדְתִּיךָ) is explained from Egyptian as equivalent to 'I have spared thee.' The description of Joseph's installation as Vizier in Gn 41$^{41-44}$ is brief but accurate in every detail: note v.^{42} '*the* gold chain' (not *a*, A.V., R.V.), *i.e.* the chain which such an official habitually received at his investiture. 'Father' (45^{8}) is a common Egyptian priestly title (cf. 41^{45}). The word מִצְרַיִם, which, regarded as a dual, has usually—and Yahuda believes rightly—been taken to refer to Upper and Lower Egypt, is explained by him, for the first time, as a Hebrew adaptation of the Egyptian word *tꜣ.wj* 'the two lands,' dual of *tꜣ*, 'land.'

Particularly interesting is his discussion of הָאִישׁ, a word which occurs with curious frequency (42$^{30.\,33}$ 43$^{3.\,5}$) in reference to Joseph, and which turns out to be an Egyptian official title. This throws fresh light on Ex 2^{14}. The translation in A.V. and R.V.: 'Who made thee a prince and a judge over us?'—ignores the word אִישׁ, which in the original precedes שַׂר וְשֹׁפֵט. Dr. Yahuda regards the three words as a gradation and takes the meaning to be, 'Who made thee Lord Chief Justice (Vizier), or one of the higher judges, or even an ordinary judge?' שַׂר is often quite clearly not 'prince,' but an official of some kind; cf. 40^{2}, the שַׂר of the butlers and the bakers. There has been much dispute over the meaning of Joseph's Egyptian name Çaphʿnath-paʿneaḥ (41^{45}): it has been commonly interpreted as 'The God speaks; may he live,' and as theophorous names are particularly common in the eighth and seventh centuries B.C., this has been taken to confirm the current critical view of the date of the Hebrew document in which the name occurs. But Dr. Yahuda points out that in such cases the name of the god—Ptach, Horus, Thoth, etc.—under whose protection the person named is to come, is always added; besides, such a name, however applicable to a new-born child, would be totally inapplicable to a vizier: he therefore interprets the name as meaning, 'This living one is the nourishment (*i.e.* nourisher) of the land'—an allusion to Joseph's official position as controller of the grain supply (42^{6}). For Moses he also suggests a new interpretation, 'child of the Nile,' deriving it from *mw* ('water,' *i.e.* seed, child) and *š*^{e} (the Nile). The prison, בֵּית הַסֹּהַר, in which Joseph was shut up, is not an ordinary prison, but the massive fortress *Tꜣr* on the border of Egypt and Palestine in which great criminals and particularly political offenders were confined (Gn 39^{20}). In Ex 4^{16} Aaron is described as the 'mouth' of Moses, this being the title of a very high court official, while Moses is as אלהים, whose Egyptian equivalent *ntr* is one of the highest attributes of Pharaoh.

In Ex 10^{5} it is said that the locusts will cover אֶת־עֵין הָאָרֶץ, which our versions render by 'the *face* of the earth,' but the literal translation 'the *eye* of the land' is correct, and by it *the sun* is meant, as clear from v.^{15}, where, as a consequence, 'the land was darkened.' In Gn 42^{23} שמע ('hear') is used in the sense of 'understand'—'they knew not that Joseph *understood* them' (שֹׁמֵעַ). But this should hardly be pressed as due to Egyptian influence: it is a good Hebrew usage (cf. Gn 11^{7}, Jer 5^{15}), and the same idiom is found in a language so remote from Egyptian as Efik. Similarly it hardly seems necessary to refer to Egyptian so obvious a phrase for multitude as 'the sand of the sea.' A really important point, however, is scored by Dr. Yahuda, when he suggests that such a phrase as 'it came to pass in (the course of) those many days' (Ex 2^{23}) does not necessarily imply a long interval of time: in Egyptian popular narrative it merely indicates a transition from one phase of the story to another. So Egyptian usage, he argues, throws light upon Hebrew narrative style.

Striking, however, as are the analogies between Egyptian and Hebrew in the stories of Joseph and Moses, the second and longer part of the volume, dealing with Egyptian influence upon the tales of the early world (Gn 1–11) and of the patriarchs, is more interesting and arresting still. Dr. Yahuda acknowledges the presence of Assyrio-Babylonian elements in Gn 1–11 as frankly as any Assyriologist could wish, but he insists that Egyptian elements are present even more abundantly, and that their influence is palpably felt both in the language and in the substance of the tales. Indeed, traces of Accadian in the language are nothing like so prominent as one might expect, considering the Accadian origin of these tales. For example, none of the Accadian words for ship is used to designate Noah's ark, but תֵּבָה, which is just the Egyptian *dp.t.* Again, he does not accept the common belief that תְּהוֹם points back to the mythological Tiāmat: it is simply the Hebrew equivalent for *tāmtu* or *tāmdu*, the primeval ocean (cf. Gn 7^{11} 8^{2}). The 'hovering' or 'fluttering' (רחף) of the spirit of God, like a bird, over the face of the waters, is ascribed to Egyptian influence and supported by the Egyptian analogy of the sun-god Re, who flew over the primeval waters in the form of a goose, scattering light with his wings. (But this view would be invalidated by Professor J. M. P. Smith's translation, 'a mighty wind was beating upon the surface of the waters.' *Old Testament Essays* [Griffin & Co.], p. 169.) שָׁמַיִם, which is treated as a dual, is traced to the Egyptian conception of two heavens, through one of which—that in the underworld, the world of the dead—the sun was believed to travel by night. Hebrew, of course, does not share this conception. Indeed, Dr. Yahuda sees in the statement that the purpose of the heavenly bodies was 'to give light *upon* the *earth*' (Gn $1^{15.\ 17}$), a subtle but deliberate protest against the Egyptian belief: so that while the (?) dual word embodies an Egyptian reminiscence, the passage itself is anti-Egyptian. It is also curious that in the Creation story, the birds seem to be associated with the fish as originating in the waters (Gn $1^{20f.}$). Here also Dr. Yahuda detects Egyptian influence. The birds in which the Egyptians were chiefly interested had their nests in the swamps and thickets of the Nile meadows. The phrase 'God *saw that it was good*' recalls, we are told, an expression common upon the lips of Egyptian workers in art, though it hardly seems necessary to account for the phrase in this way.

אָדָם is connected with אֲדָמָה, the red earth. Why the red? Because, it appears, in Egyptian, the Red, as distinguished from the Black, which was a designation for Egypt, is a term used to describe unfruitful land, or the nomad-inhabited wilderness. Contrasted with this is Eden, which is conceived as an oasis, near the western horizon. The doom which follows the sin of אדם is that he is driven from the oasis, in which is the garden of God, to the inhospitable אדמה from which he was taken (3^{23}). The statement that 'man was formed from the dust of the ground' (Gn 2^{7}) is, according to Dr. Yahuda, a later correction or at least modification of $1^{26f.}$, which, representing man as made in the image of God, might too readily suggest the physical similarity of God and man. The verse 2^{7}, by suggesting the lowly origin of man, and by placing him in this respect—as formed from the אדמה—on a level with the beasts (2^{19}), not only rules out any interpretation of $1^{26f.}$ which would lift man to a place of equality with God, but also, by accentuating thus his distance from God, prepares the way for the story of the Fall. It is easy to see how such a view as this, which regards Gn 1 as older than Gn 2, overturns the whole current conception of Pentateuchal criticism. Most critics would rather regard the sublimity and reticence of the Creation story in Gn 1 as an implicit criticism of the facile and primitive anthropomorphism of Gn 2.

The four streams, Pison, Gihon, Tigris, and Euphrates, which were in some way connected with the stream which flowed through Paradise (2^{10-14}), are the four great rivers of the world; the two last water the eastern world and the two former presumably the western. Dr. Yahuda argues powerfully for the view that Pison and Gihon stand for two divisions of the Nile, Pison being the Egyptian Nile as far as Assouan, and Gihon the Nubian Nile. In the *four* streams he detects the monotheistic and universalistic tendency of the Hebrew writer: to the Egyptians the Nile was the only 'heavenly' stream, and so did the other peoples regard their river. There is no space to pursue the detail further. Suffice it to say that nearly a hundred pages are devoted to the stories of the Creation and the Fall, and every feature of these stories—the creation of woman, the two trees, the serpent, etc.—assumes a fresh interest and often a clearer meaning in the light of the numerous Egyptian analogies. The serpent-motif, *e.g.* in the Hebrew story, is held to be better illustrated by the numerous parallels in Egyptian fable than by the 'single and very dubious parallel,' to which Delitzsch appeals, of the Babylonian cylinder-seal, with its man and woman sitting on either side of a fruit tree and a serpent erecting itself behind the woman.

The Flood story has usually been held to be peculiarly Babylonian. Dr. Yahuda has argued, however, we think successfully, that here also Egyptian elements are present. Apart from the fact, already alluded to, that the word for 'ark' is Egyptian, one of the explanations of the origin of the Flood is, he thinks, demonstrably Egyptian. According to 7^{11} the world was submerged, because 'the fountains of the great deep were broken up,' and 'the windows of heaven were opened.' The latter phrase, which points to a terrific rainstorm, represents the Babylonian version of the Flood: the former, which regards the Flood as due to an overflow, is the Egyptian version, by which the original Babylonian conception has been expanded. The 'overflow' is the form in which the Divine visitation overtakes 'rainless' Egypt. Here, as in the case of the four rivers, the Hebrew story has a definitely universal outlook; and the chronology of the Flood and its various periods are shown to correspond exactly with the periods of the rise and fall of the Nile.

Again, while the Babylonian origin of the story of the Tower of Babel is frankly admitted, it is contended that here also the presence of Egyptian elements is undeniable. The statement, *e.g.*, in Gn 11^{3} that the builders 'had brick for stone and bitumen for mortar,' has, it is claimed, Egyptian conditions in view. 'Such an explanation can only have been designed for circles where the use of brick for monumental buildings was a thing unheard of, but this is in high degree applicable to Egypt; for here brick was used for houses, corn-stores, and similar buildings, but not for gigantic monuments of the rank of the tower of Babel, for which the Egyptians used great blocks of stone or well-hewn squared stones of granite or basalt. Only in view of this did it seem to the writer appropriate to call attention to the fact that in Babylon brick was substituted for stones in buildings of great public significance and height.'

The rest of the book is taken up with the discussion of the fanciful etymologies of Hebrew proper names in Genesis, illustrated by Egyptian analogies, and with Hebrew words or phrases either borrowed from or influenced by Egyptian. *E.g.*, in the phrase רֵיחַ הַנִּיחֹחַ (Gn 8^{21}), which E.V. renders by 'sweet savour,' and the *Oxford Lexicon*, connecting it with נוּחַ, 'to rest,' renders by 'odour of *soothing* (to God),' '*tranquillizing* odour (of ascending sacrifices),' Dr. Yahuda derives ניחח from the Egyptian *nḥḥ*, 'eternity,' and renders by 'eternal savour.' The broad thesis of the book—that the Pentateuch has been profoundly influenced by Egyptian—is supported by an amplitude of detail, of which this brief sketch can furnish but the remotest idea, and the conclusion of the whole matter is that the linguistic phenomena exhibited by the Pentateuch, or at any rate by Genesis and the sections of Exodus dealt with in this volume, are only possible and intelligible within an environment in which Hebrews and Egyptians lived together. Dr. Yahuda's contention, if it be held to be proved, would carry fateful consequences in other than linguistic directions. It would involve a radical revision, and indeed overthrow, of current critical conceptions of early Hebrew literature. It would, as he hints in his Preface, necessitate the complete transformation of the prevailing view of the origin and development of the religion of Israel. If the Pentateuch is only explicable in an Egyptian *milieu*, then the critics will have to begin their work all over again.

It would be unfair to Dr. Yahuda to reject the conclusion towards which his first volume points until the appearance of the second volume, which will continue and substantiate his argument. He seems to have proved beyond the shadow of a doubt that the influence of Egyptian upon the Hebrew literature which he has examined so closely is far more profound and pervasive than has hitherto been suspected. But the explanation which he offers is far from being the only possible one. Archæology, history, and literature unite in assuring us that for centuries Egypt was in intimate contact with Canaan. In the tenth century B.C., Solomon married an Egyptian princess, and Jeroboam fled to Egypt; in the seventh century the prophet Uriah took refuge from the wrath of Jehoiakim in Egypt, from which he was extradited; probably in that century and certainly in the following there were Jewish mercenaries in the service of Pharaoh; in the later days of Jeremiah there was a Jewish settlement in Egypt; and in the fifth century there was a Jewish military colony at Elephantine. This is the period—from the tenth to the fifth centuries—within which the critics place the constituent documents of the Pentateuch for a multitude of reasons which seem to them conclusive. Further, there is practically no doubt of the intimate connexion of Pr 22^{17}–24^{22} or ^{34} with the Teaching of Amen-em-ope. In view of all this, the strong Egyptian colouring of the Pentateuch can hardly be said to tell infallibly in favour of a date as early as Israel's sojourn in Egypt, or to outweigh the varied and abundant evidence which points to different literary strata and a later date or dates.

But, however that may be, it cannot and will not be denied that Dr. Yahuda has given an immense impetus to a fresh study of Israel's tales of the early world and the patriarchs. The facts which he adduces, with all the authority of a wide and intimate knowledge of Egyptian literature, compel a re-examination of the whole problem. Not so long ago it used to be said that the influence of Egypt upon the Old Testament was negligible. Dr. Yahuda has dissipated this misconception once for all. He very justly claims that by the investigation of Hebrew in the light of Egyptian, new horizons are opened up, and the student of the Old Testament will henceforth have to reckon with Egyptian no less seriously than with Babylonian. This is the indefeasible merit of Dr. Yahuda's very erudite book, and no difference of opinion on other matters can rob him of it. Whether the book will inaugurate a new era in Pentateuchal criticism remains to be seen, but in any case it must be recognized as a weighty and even momentous contribution to Old Testament science, opening up, as it does, if not exactly an undiscovered field, at any rate a field of unsuspected fertility and promise. The book has already attracted the attention of scholars in Germany, Italy, and Spain, and an English translation of it is being projected. It is much to be hoped that its appearance may not be long delayed, as it furnishes a fresh approach to a study which is in danger of moving along conventional lines, and it cannot fail to be gratefully welcomed by every real student of the Old Testament.

The Blessing of the Peacemakers.

By Professor B. W. Bacon, D.D., Yale.

One of the most poetically beautiful sermons ever addressed to a Jewish synagogue, and one of the most deeply religious, is preserved to us in outline in the Talmudic treatise, *Genesis Rabba*, 66. 2, where, in speaking of the Reconciliation of Israel, the rabbi quotes Is 66^{12}, 'I will extend peace to her like a river,' and in his comment dwells upon Ca 6^{13} (Heb. 7^{1}), translated in our English versions, 'Return, return, O Shulammite; return, return!'

The Hebrew word for 'return' (*shubi*) is identical with that elsewhere translated 'repent.' It is repeated four times in succession in the entreaty to the Shulammite, who, in rabbinic interpretation of the Song of Songs, is always taken to represent Israel, Jehovah's erring bride. Repentance, a favourite theme of rabbinic exhortation, is therefore the general subject of the sermon; but, as both selected passages show, the tone of the appeal is much nearer to the winning accents of the Servant of God who neither strives nor cries aloud, nor causes his voice to be heard in the streets, who will neither break the crushed reed, nor quench the smoking lampwick, till he has sent forth true religion to its victory, than to the austere voice of the prophet of doom crying like Jonah to the Ninevites, 'Yet forty days and Nineveh shall be destroyed.'

As all students of the post-Isaian literature of Israel know, there is an immense contrast in tone between the prophets of denunciation, who, like a Malachi or a John the Baptist, seek to drive Israel to repentance by threats of fire unquenchable, and those who, like Hosea, or more especially the Wisdom writers of the period nearest to Jesus' own time, seek to win her by the entreaties of Jehovah's love. It is the tone of the Wisdom writers which characterizes the appeal of our rabbi. Wisdom is the gentle, pleading spirit of Jehovah's redeeming love, yearning over His wayward sons. She stands at the head of the streets entreating men to turn from their folly and accept her easy yoke. But to all save the remnant of the 'children' by whom she is justified, she pleads in vain. Men reject her and turn after folly. The Plaints of rejected Wisdom form the classic theme of such Wisdom lyrics as Pr 1–10, Ecclus 24, and Bar 3^{9}–4^{4}. One such seems to be quoted in Lk $11^{49f.}$ $13^{34f.}$.

Unquestionably the contrast between these two types of appeal is depicted in the great Q discourse of Jesus uttered to the multitude after the departure of the messengers of John (Mt $11^{16ff.}$ = Lk $7^{31ff.}$). The warnings of the Baptist are compared to the harsh notes of funeral wailing, to which the evil generation gives no more heed than to the wedding music of Jesus' glad tidings of forgiveness to the penitent. John's message had come like the terror-awakening cry of Jonah which the Ninevites had accepted without a miracle. The wisdom of Solomon had drawn the Queen of the South from the ends of the earth. But this evil and adulterous generation demands a sign from heaven, and turns a deaf ear both to the warnings which are 'a greater matter (πλεῖον) than Jonah' and to the winning entreaty of Jesus supported though it is by gracious tokens of Divine healing and forgiveness, a work of the Wisdom of God which is 'a greater matter (πλεῖον) than Solomon.'

In every respect save its typically rabbinic style of Scripture exposition our rabbi's appeal might well serve as an example of Jesus' own exhortations to repentance in the synagogues of Galilee, more especially because of the connexion which it makes between the theme of Wisdom's entreaty to Israel and the Isaian ideal of Israel as Jehovah's Servant, the priest-nation destined to bring many to justification through knowledge of the true God, a light to lighten the darkness of the Gentiles, God's 'witnesses' to all the ends of the earth. The Wisdom writers carry onward this theme also. Israel's knowledge of Divine truth is to make her like the fourfold stream which watered the Paradise of God and flowed forth thence to the four corners of the earth (Ecclus 24^{30-32}). The broadening stream flowing from beneath the threshold of her temple, the abode of God's Wisdom, would carry life and verdure to all the desert regions round about. This great theme of the post-exilic prophets and Wisdom writers is the secondary development of our rabbi's sermon. Israel's repentance is to prove the salvation of the world, because when she has turned again God's gracious purpose of redemption for all the Gentiles will be fulfilled. In short, the full argument of the exhortation is: Repentant Israel the divinely ordained agent of world redemption. Truly we have here such a scribe as he of whom Jesus testified, 'Thou art not far from the kingdom of God.'

As respects substance, it should be already clear that our Jewish *midrash* finely illustrates the type of religious thought most nearly akin to Jesus' own preaching of repentance throughout the synagogues of Galilee. As respects the rabbinic form some further explanation is needed.

We have already noted how the rabbis anticipate early Christian interpretation of the Song of Songs by allegory in which the Shulammite appears as Jehovah's bride. To the great teacher and martyr, Akiba, early in the second century, this book was 'the holy of holies' of Scripture, because it depicted the inalienable love of Jehovah for Israel, His erring bride, in terms more endearing than even those of a Hosea or an Isaiah. Our synagogue preacher avails himself of this convention, and in addition plays upon the name 'Shulammite,' connecting it with the stem whose meaning is 'Peace.' It is as if he would make the Divine Lover's entreaty take the form, 'Turn back, my wandering dove of peace.' For it is this title Shulammite, that is, people of *peace*, which leads him to connect the entreaty to 'turn again' with two significant passages from Isaiah in which that prophet hails Israel as the people destined to bring peace to the world, or, in other words, reconciliation with the God from whom it has become estranged.

The first passage quoted is Is 66^{12}, 'Thus saith Jehovah, Behold, I will extend peace to her like a river, and the glory of the (Gentile) nations like an overflowing stream.' The second is Is $1^{26f.}$, 'I will restore thy judges as at the first, and thy counsellors as at the beginning: afterward thou shalt be called The city of righteousness, the faithful city. Zion shall be redeemed with judgment, and they that return of her (Eng. "her converts"; Heb. *shabeiha*) with righteousness.' The play is upon the terms 'repentance' and 'peace.' From Ca 6^{13} the preacher takes the fourfold entreaty, 'Return, return, return, return!' and the title 'people of peace'; from Isaiah he takes the conception of this peace as not merely Israel's own reconciliation with God, but the reconciliation of the world.

This important corollary is not only symbolized by the classic comparison of Zion's peace to a river whose flow brings salvation to the Gentiles, a comparison to the 'four heads' of the river of Paradise which the preacher perhaps intends to recall by the choice of a text in which the plea for repentance appears in fourfold form, but is explicitly stated to be the great goal in view. Israel becomes the people of peace by 'making peace for the world.'

It is only as an illustration of that type of synagogue teaching which came nearest to Jesus' own that we can avail ourselves of the rabbinic parallel so far as Jesus' message is concerned. Verbal or literary connexion cannot be imagined to exist. No more can be probably assumed in the case of two other primitive Christian writers, both of whom had special occasion to know the best thought of the synagogue. And yet in the case of Paul and our first evangelist, who paints his own portrait in the words he uses to describe the ideal church teacher, 'a scribe who has been made a disciple to the kingdom of heaven, who brings forth from his store things new and old,' we have at least reflections of the same traditional modes of thought.

Paul brings to a close his sublime defence of 'the ministry,' to whose ranks he has been called, in 2 Co 3^{1}–6^{10}, supplying a definition in 5^{18-21} of what he designates 'the ministry of reconciliation.' The apostles and evangelists are bearers of a 'gospel of peace,' the message that God, through the work of Christ 'was reconciling the world unto Himself, not reckoning unto men their trespasses.' This ministry of reconciliation God had committed to Paul and his fellow-evangelists, entrusting them with the 'word of reconciliation,' a message to which in Ro 10^{15} he applies the Isaian figure, ‘How beautiful upon the mountains are the feet of them that bring glad tidings of peace!’ His conclusion is, ‘We, then, are ambassadors on behalf of Christ, as though God were entreating by us: we beseech you on behalf of Christ, be ye reconciled to God.’ Surely there is some affinity between the rabbinic ideal of repentant Israel as ‘the people of peace,’ so called because they ‘make peace for the world’ with the God from whom both had become estranged, and Paul’s ideal of the bearers of Christ’s ‘gospel of peace’ who are made God’s ambassadors of peace to the world, as though God were thus entreating his wayward sons to return and ‘be reconciled’ to Him.

Lastly, let us turn to those beatitudes which are not found elsewhere, but which Mt. substitutes for the Woes of Luke’s version of the Sermon on the Righteousness of Sons. They are attached (except for that on ‘the meek,’ drawn from Ps 37^{11}, whose placing varies in the MSS) between the first three, in which Mt. coincides with Lk., and that of the ‘persecuted’ in which the two Evangelists again come into coincidence. Of the beatitudes on ‘the merciful’ (v.^{7}) and on the inwardly pure (‘pure in heart,’ v.^{8}) we need say no more than that they represent qualities of the Christian disciple which are peculiarly significant to this Evangelist (cf. Mt 18^{23-35} 15^{10-20}). Our present concern is with the last of these added beatitudes, the blessing pronounced upon the ‘peacemakers,’ and the particular form given to their reward, the fact that they are given that right which the heathen world disputes with Israel, and the Christian Church later with both pagan world and the Synagogue (Jn $1^{12f.}$, 1 Jn $3^{1ff.}$ 4^{1}–5^{1}), ‘the right to be called children of God.’ Is it not probable, considering how closely this scribe-evangelist approaches to the best and highest ideals of Israel’s teachers, that he, too, has been influenced by the poetically beautiful and deeply religious hopes and aspirations of those scribes of his time who were not far from the kingdom of God? For we have seen that there were scribes of the older order who preached repentance to Israel as the ‘entreaty’ of their Father in heaven, and offered them a ‘gospel of peace’ not merely that they themselves might be ‘reconciled to God,’ but that through repentance they might become worthy to bear the name of His children, as makers of ‘peace for the world.’ It is in this sense, at all events, that we must take the unique benediction of the scribe-evangelist:

> Blessed are the peacemakers;
> For they shall be called the children of God.

Literature.

THE IDEA OF VALUE.

The very title of this handsome volume—*The Idea of Value*, by Professor John Laird, M.A. (Cambridge University Press; 18s. net)—is intriguing, as intriguing as a book on ‘Evolution’ was forty years ago, for, as Pringle Pattison says, in our day ‘philosophical discussion is carried on more explicitly in terms of value than at any previous time’ (‘Idea of God,’ 39). Indeed, it may be said that explicitly since the time of Kant and Lotze—not to speak of Albrecht Ritschl in theology—this has been regarded as the best approach to philosophy and as supplying the key for the solution of its ultimate problems. Professor Laird hints, and we agree with him, that this was implicitly the problem of philosophy even before Kant’s day. In scholasticism, to take but one instance, was not the dispute between Nominalist and Realist just a dispute as to the relation between value and existence? And such was surely the case in the great ontological argument of Anselm.

What, then, could be more timely than a serious volume by one who is deservedly regarded as a master in philosophy on this whole matter, written with full consciousness of the gravity of his subject. The title of the book and the reputation of the author raise high expectations in the reader. Professor Laird justifies himself for including the province of economics in his discussion. His treatment of that department is a sufficient justification for his so doing. The student of economic science, as well as the student of art or of morals, will find here subtle criticism and keen analysis of the concept of value prevailing in their respective fields. He discusses his subject-matter under the three heads, *bonum utile*, *bonum jucundum*, and *bonum honestum*, and in each of these departments we have abundant evidence of adequate historical knowledge, penetrating criticism, and real insight.

As a realist he devotes considerable space to the British moralists and particularly to the Scottish School, and no one can read his long critical discussion on what the exponents of hedonism have to say concerning value without acknowledging his mastery in this field. If anything, his destructive criticism here suffers from over-elaborateness. We do not care to express an opinion as to the value of his criticism on the application of arithmetic, whether by Bentham or Bernoulli or others, to the pleasures and satisfactions of human beings; we feel that the whole attempt has more an historical and antiquarian interest than a practical and philosophical one.

His treatment of Spinoza, of Reid and Price, as well as of Kant, is of more interest to the readers of this magazine, for here in our opinion he comes nearer the heart of his subject, and in chap. ix. he works towards a conclusion, namely, that in true valuing there is something more than mere caprice or subjective pleasing; there is 'objectivity.' With this we agree, as well as with his notion that men's activity in preferring and valuing may reveal the nature of a reality greater than they are conscious of at the moment. But here our author stops, and this is just where we feel he ought to begin his serious work. And so after we have finished this book and enjoyed its style—which has its mannerisms, for example, the frequent usage of the phrase 'to be sure' and others—and substance, we have the uneasy feeling that there is something lacking—and that something of the greatest importance.

Is it not, as Pringle Pattison again says, just because at bottom it is a question of 'the divineness or the undivineness of the universe' that is at issue that the question of values is important? Is the ultimate essence and cause of all things only dust that rises up and is lightly laid again, or is it the Eternal Love with which Dante closes his vision —'the Love that moves the Sun and the other Stars'? This is the great alternative, and in our opinion a treatment of value claiming to be exhaustive that fails to deal with this suffers from an aching lacuna where a lacuna is disastrous. It is like a bridge without a keystone. We could well dispense with Maupertius and marginal increments for even a little discussion on this. This omission is all the more regrettable because we feel that the writer is on right lines. Surely something ought to have been said by the author on those writers, from Lange and Lotze to Pringle Pattison and Bosanquet, who have dealt with this question on the metaphysical arena—not to speak of those psychologists who maintain that all our values are the creations of our libidines and urges without any real objectivity. The book claims relative comprehensiveness of treatment, and in our opinion economics, art, and morals alike lead inevitably to metaphysics and theology, in which provinces alone the ultimate meaning and value of values can be determined. We are thankful for what we have in this book, and we therefore all the more regret what we have not. Our sincere hope is that in some future volume this versatile and scholarly author may himself rectify his omission.

ABRAHAM'S EARLY HOME.

Less than a century ago our knowledge of Babylonian and Assyrian history was so limited that no scholar would have attempted to put it in writing; to-day, owing to recent exploration, a single city in Lower Babylonia furnishes sufficient material for a large volume. In *History and Monuments of Ur* (Chatto & Windus; 15s. net), by Mr. C. J. Gadd, M.A., F.S.A., of the Department of Egyptian and Assyrian Antiquities in the British Museum, we have depicted for us the local history of a city which existed as a centre of culture and the seat of the Moon-god's worship long before the Flood. The author has gathered from many sources the most interesting facts now known concerning its fortunes for more than two thousand five hundred years. In an attractive style he leads the reader from the prehistoric period through the brilliant Sumerian and later Semitic kingdoms up to the final destruction by the Persians. The battle of the four kings with five (Gn 14), the connexion of Abraham with Ur, the identity of the Ḥabiru with the Hebrews, and other matters are discussed. The book, needless to say, is the work of a competent scholar who has had some personal acquaintance with the city. It deserves to be said that it is beautifully illustrated with thirty-two plates, and contains a bibliography and index. Biblical students will find the volume an undoubted aid in understanding the beginnings of Israelite history.

NABONIDUS AND BELSHAZZAR.

Professor Raymond Philip Dougherty has given us a model discussion of an important and complicated historical problem in his *Nabonidus and Belshazzar: A Study of the Closing Events of the Neo-Babylonian Empire* (Milford; 13s. 6d. net).

As Curator of the Babylonian Collection in Yale University, doubtless Professor Dougherty started with certain advantages for such a study, but no one will deny that he has made good use of them. His book is marked by the genuine spirit of research and also by discriminating judgment; and he does his readers the inestimable service of carrying them back to the original Babylonian sources, which he presents in transliteration and translation, while in his argument he draws upon all the available sources—Greek, Jewish, and Ecclesiastical, as well as cuneiform. In particular he is inclined to give more weight to the evidence of Herodotus than it has been customary to do.

The facts adduced by Professor Dougherty compel us to modify at several important points the current view of the history about and before the fall of Babylon, and of some of the chief historical characters. Nabonidus, for example, has been derided as little more than an antiquarian without concern for the political and military welfare of his empire, whose chief interest was in 'digging down to old foundations and reading the inscriptions of his predecessors.' In this volume we learn how grave an injustice is done to him by such an estimate. 'In reality Nabonidus is no longer presented to our view as a monarch who devoted most of his time to an investigation of the past. What is now known concerning his career shows that much more important matters absorbed his attention.' It is certainly curious that he elected to stay away from Babylon for eight years at Tema (apparently the famous oasis) in Arabia, and one of the best parts of the book is a discussion of the motives, whether military, strategical, religious, antiquarian, or personal, which help to account for this; but though there may have been a blend of many motives, the conclusion is that 'some overwhelming political purpose, such as the establishment of real sovereignty over the Westland or the cementing of essential alliances, must have induced him to make Arabia the centre from which his influence radiated.'

Professor Dougherty contests the view that he was a usurper. He came of a noble family, had early experience of affairs, and he was the son-in-law of Nebuchadrezzar. His wife, Nitocris, whose name is Egyptian, was the daughter of Nebuchadrezzar—so runs the argument—by an Egyptian princess, who may well have been the daughter of Necho, whom Nebuchadrezzar defeated at Carchemish in 605 B.C., and with whom he may have made a treaty and sealed it by this marriage. These are only conjectures, but they are not without plausibility. Belshazzar, called 'King' in Dn 5[1], seems to have been associated with his father Nabonidus in the government of the Babylonian empire, and during his father's absence in Arabia he was ruler in Babylon; indeed, 'there are many texts which indicate that Belshazzar almost equalled Nabonidus in position and prestige.'

Another point in which current conceptions are modified is the attitude of the Babylonians to Cyrus. They at first resisted him with great animosity, and the existence of an initial hostility between them is further attested by the Greek historians. It is of peculiar interest to hear so competent an investigator announce that 'of all non-Babylonian records dealing with the situation at the close of the Neo-Babylonian empire *the fifth chapter of Daniel ranks next to cuneiform literature in accuracy* so far as outstanding events are concerned.' It begins to look as if Biblical traditions deserve more credence than critics have sometimes been willing to concede to them. Altogether this is a book to be welcomed for its clear arrangement of facts and for its substantial addition to our information.

TIME.

'Nothing is more striking in modern thought than the *rapprochement* between physics and metaphysics, particularly since the eighties of last century, when the Michelson-Morley experiment was performed. . . . This is largely because the new physics, having rejected the Absolute Motion, Time and Space of Newton, is thrown back to a discussion of its own fundamental concepts. This brings physics to the borderland of metaphysics, and the *rapprochement* centres around Time, hence its prominence in contemporary thought.' We quote from a remarkable book, *The Problem of Time*, by Mr. J. Alexander Gunn, Ph.D. (Allen & Unwin; 16s. net). From the first dawn of speculation until now there has been no problem that has seemed so baffling as that of Time. The problem might be popularly expressed thus. 'Time flies, it is said. What is the medium of its flight? Space? Certainly not, for then time would be a spatial object, akin to an arrow or an electric current. If time flies, it is argued, then it is in time that it flies, so we get the paradox of two times, one of which moves while the other is permanent and unchanging.'

Dr. Gunn's treatise is a monument of learning and industry. It may be confidently affirmed that no such historical and critical study of the subject has ever before been produced. With extraordinary care and competence he has traced lines of thought from the earliest times of Greek philosophy down to the present day. He is equally at home in physics and in metaphysics. It should be said, however, that his work is not for the general reader. Especially when he deals with the theory of relativity he assumes more knowledge than many students of philosophy possess, but his review of the criticisms of that theory which have been offered by competent philosophic thinkers is most illuminating. Where the united wisdom of the ages has failed to solve the riddle of time it is not to be thought that Dr. Gunn succeeds. He indeed offers no solution, but by his survey and criticism of the work of previous thinkers he has contributed a valuable chapter to the history of philosophy.

THE BELIEF OF PASCAL.

We owe a very considerable debt to Professor Clement C. J. Webb of Oxford for his writings on theology, and particularly on the philosophy of religion, and he has added to our debt by his new book on *Pascal's Philosophy of Religion* (Milford; 6s. net). Pascal is not a figure who would be sympathetic to Professor Webb. But he is a thinker whose significance has been largely ignored by historians of philosophy, and he is one who in some measure has anticipated the modern point of view. It is apparently these facts that have attracted Professor Webb to him as a subject of exposition. The book is a delightful one to read, with far less of the involved style that sometimes makes Professor Webb a little exhausting, and it is one that, while dealing with a far-off personality, takes us right to the heart of problems which are occupying us to-day.

The prevailing religious philosophy of Pascal's day regarded belief as something that could be established by intellectual means. This was the position of Descartes, to whom Pascal owed much. Pascal dissented from this. For him the one way to belief was experience of the grace of God in Christ. It was in this standpoint that he anticipated the position of our own day—that the notion of God is one reached only through that specific experience which we call religion. In this also Pascal differs from the Roman Church which, curiously, has become the champion of the rights of the old 'natural theology.'

The main burden of Professor Webb's study has been indicated. But there are separate discussions of every aspect of Pascal's thought and belief. And in the course of these chapters the reader will find himself being conducted through the whole field of religious doctrine by one who is a delightful and illuminating cicerone.

THE SCIENCE OF CHARACTER.

Just as the Middle Ages were largely dominated by the science of formal logic as a key to the explanation of all reality, so it would appear that our own age is very largely dominated by the science of psychology. There is, however, this important change, that experts differ as to what psychology itself really is. In this volume, *The Science of Character*, by Ludwig Klages (Allen & Unwin; 10s. 6d. net), who is designated 'the leading psychologist of Germany,' excellently translated by Mr. W. H. Johnston, B.A., one of the translators also of Hegel's 'Science of Logic' and himself a distinguished philosopher, we have a view of the principles of psychology which is unusual, and worthy of serious consideration. Certain features only of his view can be mentioned here, and for the rest the book itself must be read.

There is to begin with a wholesome insistence on the uniqueness of every individual person—a point very specially emphasized by the personal idealists and pragmatists, and by none more so or more brilliantly than by William James. To ignore this and to factorize men into sensations, conations, and intellections, these in turn being analysed into neurotic and physiological processes, is in the author's opinion the bane and the barrenness of 'modern' psychology. 'The entire achievements of the so-called science in this respect is outweighed by a single page of Goethe or of Jean Paul's psychology' (p. 51). So thorough is this individualism of the author that Nietzsche and Max Stirner become respectable in their revolt, until we wonder if there is such a thing as a general science of psychology at all.

Secondly, the author insists on the unity of man's spiritual life. Sensations in man cannot be explained if we forget that they are the sensations of a living, conscious, volitional, spiritual being. The writer revives the old trichotomy familiar to theologians and Greek philosophers of body, soul, and spirit.

Thirdly, the book is largely concerned with the different types of moral character—characterology, as he calls it; and there is an attempt psychologically to explain them and reduce them to type—a kind of attempt with psychological urges as the explanatory principle, such as the crude attempt of

Theophrastus. Thus he deals with what may be called moral psychology, and he gives in three appendices tabulated schemata of driving forces or urges of character, sensuous, personal, spiritual, corresponding to his threefold division into body, soul, and spirit.

Apart from the technical theories underlying the book and their applications there are valuable discussions, as, for instance, on the temperaments, and *obiter dicta* of a more general kind which we fancy will be unwelcome in some quarters. Thus on America and the War he says: 'America made war on Germany in honest indignation because it was printed in the newspapers that Prussian militarism wanted to conquer the world and was rioting in devilish crimes; and this was printed in the newspapers because a few high priests of Mammon hoped that American intervention in the War would be a lucrative business for them. Americans thought they were fighting for pretty phrases like liberty and justice; in fact they were fighting for the increase of bank reserves. These "free citizens" are in fact puppets who imagine they are free, and a single glance at American methods of work, or American methods of amusement, is enough to show that *l'homme machine* is no longer imminent, but has already become reality there' (p. 270). This is a hard saying, and if, like Ecclesiastes, he 'looked again' he might come to a different and perhaps a juster conclusion. The author is a pessimist who is convinced that all nations will become by and by mechanised—'but this is of no particular interest, since in the end the destruction of all is inevitable.'

In spite of this we are grateful to Mr. Johnston and the publishers for making it possible for English-speaking students to get acquainted with the views of one who has deservedly a high reputation on the continent as a psychologist. We have noticed typographical errors on pp. 48 line 11, and 225 line 17.

FOLKLORE, MAGIC, MEDIÆVAL ROMANCE.

There can be few living scholars capable of doing justice to Dr. Moses Gaster's three volumes of collected *Studies and Texts in Folklore, Magic, Mediæval Romance, Hebrew Apocrypha, and Samaritan Archæology* (Maggs Bros.), which represent the fruit of fifty years' intense preoccupation with recondite studies in many fields. Dr. Gaster writes with equal ease in English, French, and German, and is as much at home in Rumanian, Hebrew, and Samaritan as in any of these languages. The variety of topics treated in these ample volumes is astounding. They range from Unknown Hebrew Versions of the Tobit Legend and the Oldest Version of the Midrash Megillah to the Legend of the Grail, the History of the Destruction of the Round Table as told in Hebrew in the year 1279, the Legend of Merlin, the Modern Origin of Fairy Tales, Gulliver among the Lilliputians in the Twelfth Century, and English Charms of the Seventeenth Century. These are only specimens drawn from a list of sixty-one learned discussions.

But, though learned, they are never dull; sometimes, indeed, they are of thrilling interest—the sixty-five pages, for example, dealing with an old Hebrew Romance of Alexander, which is translated in full with prefatory comment, or the forty-nine pages devoted to the Sword of Moses, with its extraordinary list of charms. Equally interesting are the 'Hebrew Visions of Hell and Paradise,' where the curious will see how far the later Jews travelled from the sobriety of the Old Testament. At the gate of hell, for example, Elijah showed R. Joshua, the son of Levi, 'men hanging by their hair; these were they that let their hair grow to adorn themselves for sin. Others were hanging by their eyes; these were they that followed their eyes to sin, and did not place God before their face. Others were hanging by their noses; these were they that perfumed themselves to sin. Others were hanging by their tongues; these were they that had slandered,' and so on.

Dr. Gaster's profound knowledge of the Samaritans and their literature is amply illustrated by a number of studies devoted to Samaritan subjects. There is, for example, a very interesting Samaritan parallel, translated, to the Apocryphal story of Susanna. There are discussions of Samaritan Phylacteries and Amulets, of the Chain of Samaritan High Priests, of the Jewish knowledge of the Samaritan Alphabet in the Middle Ages, of Popular Judaism at the Time of the Second Temple in the Light of Samaritan Traditions, etc. Three plates illustrate the discussion of Samaritan Phylacteries, and there are other beautifully reproduced illustrations in the book. The discussions are characterized by all the wide and minute learning which one would expect from a scholar who can say, 'With all modesty I may claim to have seen most of the Samaritan MSS in England and in Nablus.'

Once Dr. Gaster crosses swords with Professor Deissmann. While paying a noble tribute to his 'Light from the Ancient East' as 'a book full of new suggestions,' he disputes the argument of the section entitled 'Jewish Prayers for Vengeance at Rheneia,' maintaining that these prayers are of Christian origin. On every page of these volumes is curious information, the fruit of a lifetime of learned research, and stimulus to further research.

THE RELIGION OF JESUS.

Dr. Walter E. Bundy, Professor of English Bible in De Pauw University, has written a book entitled *The Religion of Jesus* (Cassell; 12s. 6d. net) which may be regarded as belonging to the newer liberalism in Christian theology. It was Professor B. W. Bacon who familiarized many of us with the distinction between the nineteenth-century liberalism and the twentieth-century idealism. In the former, Christianity is conceived as the religion of Jesus; in the latter, as the religion about Jesus. But since the rise of the eschatological school it has been more difficult to maintain the older liberalism, and a newer liberalism has been proclaiming itself which, while no less emphatic as to the ethical or practical bearing of Christianity, does more justice to the Christian experience of religion. Of this newer tendency in liberalism, Professor Bundy's book supplies a good example.

It is not that his book is a very original contribution to theological learning. But it will be at once understood by the layman and appreciated by the student. It is based largely on the work of some recent German writers, and is much influenced by Schweitzer. The quotation that follows not only reminds us of the conclusion of 'The Quest of the Historical Jesus,' but serves to gather up the teaching of the book: 'Who was Jesus? This study has sought to show on the basis of the New Testament, the history and psychology of religion, that Jesus was a religious subject, an experient of religion, the most religious personality, the possessor of the richest and most resourceful religious experience of our human history. The author is not ready to say who Jesus was, all that He was; but he feels that Jesus is religiously sufficient for all our human needs. He feels that we may actually trust Jesus in the most serious matter of our human experience, that of living life religiously.'

Consistently with the above, and conformably with theological liberalism in general, Professor Bundy is out of sympathy with the Christian dogmatic tradition. Indeed, he appears to find no place for creed and dogma at all. He regards the acceptance of Christianity in its historical forms and statements as a useless 'intellectual sacrifice.' But most modern dogmaticians are ready to acknowledge the limitations of creed and dogma, while being at the same time convinced of their usefulness; and this is a consideration to which Professor Bundy does not give due weight.

The scope of the book may be further indicated by the titles of its five elaborate chapters, which deal successively with the religious genius, faith, consciousness, demands, and authority of Jesus, The expositions tend to be diffuse and redundant, but they are clear and vigorous in style, and the writer has many searching things to say of present-day Christianity.

DR. JOHN WHITE.

It is not enough, apparently, that 'men of the hour' occupy the most prominent positions in our daily and weekly newspapers and in our monthly magazines (with the latest photographs). It is also necessary to have their biographies from the cradle up to date. Quite recently we have had the biography of the Prince of Wales and of the new Prime Minister, and already we have a biography of the newly elected Moderator of the re-united Church of Scotland, *Dr. John White*, by Mr. Alexander Gammie (James Clarke; 5s. net). In Scotland, at all events, the first Moderator of the re-united Presbyterian Church is for the moment as important as the new Prime Minister. Dr. White has been chosen to fill the office because during the latest and most critical stages of the prolonged negotiations that preceded the union of last month he proved himself a most persuasive and influential leader in the General Assembly of his own Church. He is just over sixty, a young man for so influential a position, but with a brilliant record both at Glasgow University and the theological hall, where he studied under men of the distinction of Lord Kelvin and Edward Caird, afterwards Master of Balliol. As a minister of the Established Church of Scotland, in which at present he fills the position of minister of the historic Barony Church of Glasgow, with its three thousand members in full communion, he has shown himself a resourceful and forceful personality, an outspoken yet attractive preacher and a worthy successor to some of the ablest men in the Scottish Church. In the General Assembly of his Church he had gradually won an ascendancy in its councils that was recognized in 1925 by his election to the Moderator's chair. He is thus called a second time to that outstanding position of leadership, in which his former experience will doubtless prove invaluable. Now, however, he has to make the beginnings—and this at a most critical time in the experience of all our churches—in the delicate processes of cementing and strengthening the re-union he has worked so whole-heartedly to bring about. He has already shown himself a man of ideas and originality, and with the capacity for getting his ideas carried out. It is clearly acknowledged by the General Assembly of the newly constituted Church of Scotland that its members feel they have placed at their head a leader of resource and abounding energy equal to a great task. All that Mr. Gammie has written of his career will justify the remarkable vote of confidence passed by what may justly be described as the most representative and the most unanimous General Assembly of Presbyterian Scotland that has ever yet been convened.

Professor Hans Driesch of Leipsic wrote a book last year containing in brief compass his philosophical system. It was intended to give, in a more or less popular fashion, a complete, scientifically founded picture of the universe. Beyond the limits laid down by natural science, his philosophy does not allow itself to go. The book has been translated by Mr. W. H. Johnston, B.A., under the title *Man and the Universe* (Allen & Unwin; 6s. net).

Dr. Driesch is well known in this country as a protagonist of neo-vitalism in biological theory, nor are his metaphysical positions unknown to the English reader; and many will turn with interest to this complete, if compendious, exposition of his philosophy. We shall not attempt to outline the contents of the volume, which treats successively of the Apprehension of the Universe, the Nature of the Universe, and Man as a Member of the Universe. We should like to say, however, that there is much in it which should prove of especial interest to readers of this magazine. In particular, one recalls the references to religion and the question of immortality. And the conclusion may also be cited: 'We can never fashion a realm of pure spirit on earth. But we have the power to strive after it and to realize it if only fragmentarily. The first demand here is that selfishness, whether personal or national, be cast off.'

After more than twenty years the Baptist Missionary Society has published a new edition of the memoir of the life and work of *Alfred Saker of the Cameroons* (Carey Press; 2s. 6d. net). Mr. Saker not only established but carried on for thirty-two years what David Livingstone described as the most remarkable mission work among savage tribes on the African coast. His wife also was his comrade in all his labours, and devoted herself with unremitting toil in training women and children to be Christian wives and teachers. From first to last it is a story worthy to be retold.

In his indefatigable pursuit of great men to contribute to various symposia, Sir James Marchant has come to the subject of reunion, and in *The Reunion of Christendom: A Survey of the Present Position* (Cassell; 7s. 6d. net) he has certainly included some really big guns. To mention only a few, there are Cardinal Bourne, who opens the discussion; Archbishop Germanos of the Eastern Orthodox Church, Archbishop Söderblom, Dr. Garvie, Dr. Scott Lidgett, Principal Martin, Bishop Manning, and Dr. Orchard. They all contribute to the reader's understanding or perplexity according to their ability. The idea is that we can never have reunion until we understand one another's point of view. And certainly Cardinal Bourne leaves no doubt of his. It may be roughly summarized as follows: 'What is the good of all you others talking about unity? There is only one unity, that of the true Church. You others are outsiders. If you come in and submit you will be received, but only on complete submission.' And that is that. With the Roman Church ruled out by itself, there is more hope of the 'outsiders' coming to agreement by and by. And in any case this free discussion will enlighten Christian people as to the barriers to be overleapt before the great consummation can arrive. By that time (perhaps) the Roman Church may be willing to come down off its stilts.

In anticipation of the great ecclesiastical event in Edinburgh last month, the reunion of the United Free Church with the Church of Scotland, it was to be expected that the life-story of Dr. Thomas Chalmers, the notable leader of the Disruption in 1843, would be told afresh. This has been done in brief yet adequate and admirable form under the title *Thomas Chalmers: Apostle of Union*, by the Rev. Adam Philip, D.D. (James Clarke; 5s. net). Dr. Chalmers was even more than the leader of the four hundred ministers of the Church of Scotland who sacrificed stipends and manses for what they deemed a vital matter of conscience. Long before that event, and ever afterwards till he laid down his life, he had proved himself in the words of Principal Denney, 'our greatest Scotsman since John Knox.' One wonders how many of the present generation are at all familiar with the remarkable life-story of the very young minister of a small country church in Fifeshire who came out of a serious illness with a new outlook upon the responsibilities of his sacred calling, and thereafter left such a universal and enduring influence on the religious life of his country. What he did when suddenly called upon to deal with the appalling conditions of two populous parishes in Glasgow proved that here was a man of amazing resource, untiring energy, and the faculty of getting other men to put their shoulders to the wheel. He was the zealous evangelical preacher to crowded congregations, but he was not one whit less zealous for the education of the young and for the uplift of the victims of intemperance, laziness, and poverty. What he did for Church and school extension in Glasgow was only a foretaste of the extraordinary capacity he showed after the Disruption in establishing the Sustentation Fund, which was the means of maintaining the Free Churches in every part of Scotland. Dr. Philip has quite adequately summarized the story of the Disruption in a brief chapter, whilst he devotes another to the 'Church Leader,' and in other chapters describes his 'influence on religious life,' his 'memorable sayings,' and characteristic anecdotes about him.

Liberation (Constable; 10s. net) is the apt title of a posthumous volume by the late Dr. Stanley Alfred Mellor, who was a successor of Martineau in Liverpool, occupying for ten years the pulpit of Hope Street Unitarian Church. The first part of the volume consists of sustained reflections on the Ideal and Problem of Freedom, followed by some short addresses on certain cognate themes; but the bulk of the volume is composed of addresses and sermons on the religious life. And 'liberation' sounds the keynote of the whole. For Dr. Mellor was never content to rest in the thought-forms of tradition or convention, but kept scrutinizing them, and abandoned them unhesitatingly when they no longer commended themselves to his mind. In particular he reacted from the historic creeds and dogmas of Christendom, seeking the truth of religion along the lines of a liberal Christian theology.

He appears to have been an attractive preacher. His addresses and sermons bear witness to a direct and vivid style of utterance, and to a power of lucid exposition. If they sometimes betray a certain self-consciousness and even self-centredness, this may be forgiven in one who often felt himself driven by the compelling urge of truth over uncharted seas.

Mr. Middleton Murry, who writes an introduction to the book, says of the author: 'The question to which he had to find an answer was this: Is religion possible, now that the will-to-believe is not? Or less absolutely, and perhaps more accurately, Is religion possible for those to whom the will-to-believe is not? With this question the whole of this book is passionately, and almost exclusively, concerned.'

A Psalm that has made Heroes (Epworth Press; 2s. net) is the title of a little book by Mr. Albert J. Farnsworth, which seeks to describe some events in history in which the forty-sixth psalm brought blessing and comfort to human hearts. The descriptions, if often long drawn out, are well and clearly written. At the head of each of the ten papers composing the volume is quoted some version in English, whether translation or paraphrase, of the psalm under annotation. The writer's indebtedness to such a work as Mr. Prothero's 'The Psalms in Human Life' is obvious.

That John Wesley is still a living force in the world, no one would dream of denying. But it is instructive to see how far his influence has extended, and this has been shown to us in *Wesley as a World Force*, edited by Mr. John Telford, B.A. (Epworth Press; 3s. net). The book consists of contributions from representative men, inside and outside of Wesleyanism. Dr. W. B. Selbie opens with an article on 'What We may Learn from Wesley.' Sir William Ashley writes on 'Wesley's Influence on Christian Thought.' Then come articles, by different hands, on Wesley's Influence on England, Ireland, Scotland, America, Canada, South Africa, Australia, New Zealand, Germany, and Japan and Korea. Not only Wesleyans, but all interested in vital religion, will read these essays with interest and profit.

There is much human interest in the simple little apologetic for God and Christ which the Rev. H. Mortimer Sinfield, 'a humble Methodist minister,' presents in dialogue form in *The Only Way* (Epworth Press; paper, 1s. 6d. net; cloth, 2s. 6d. net). The illustrations may sometimes be trite and the quotations commonplace, and the apologetic may be on conventional lines, but the author has succeeded in producing a very readable book, charged with sincerity. It seems pointless, however, to raise the question of the authenticity of the Nature miracles of Jesus, only to fight shy of any discussion of it. The burden of the volume is that even if faith in God and Christ were shaken the philosophy of love would remain. But the writer's faith in God and Christ is not shaken, not even in the face of an overwhelming sorrow.

Popular Preaching, by the Rev. Dinsdale T. Young, D.D. (Epworth Press ; 3s. 6d. net), is the Fernley Lecture for 1929. In it the writer, himself a popular preacher, discourses in his own vivid and arresting way on such topics as the significance of popular preaching, its perversions, concomitants, constraints, and perils. There are passages which in their raciness remind one of Spurgeon's lectures to his students. But the predominating element is a passionate faith in the power and effectiveness of preaching. It is a book which, while containing many shrewd observations and instructive hints, is essentially a powerful series of exhortations to preachers to magnify their office and preach the Word of the gospel with hearts on fire.

The Dawn beyond the Sunset, by Mr. Norman T. M'Donald (Epworth Press ; 5s. net), is a book that will bring comfort and delight to many. The writer is the son-in-law of Dr. F. W. Boreham, and seems to have caught something of his fine sensibility and delicate touch. His book is not argumentative, but discursive and hortatory. It might almost be called an anthology, for the writer has woven into it an extraordinary number of all the finest things in prose and verse which have been written about the hereafter. It is not a book to criticise, but to meditate upon and quietly enjoy. It is wisely reticent, carefully scriptural, and breathes throughout a spirit of healthy and courageous optimism.

From the Tops of the Hills is the title of a series of short articles by the late Rev. Arthur Hoyle, reprinted from 'The Methodist Recorder,' and published by the Epworth Press (5s. net). They cover a wide field. To read these brief but suggestive essays is like listening to the pleasant talk of a man of wide reading and well-stored mind and in close touch with the religious tendencies of our time. Under the heading of 'Politicians and Parsons' he has some candid talk about reputed eloquent preachers to whom a congregation listens with the impression of gaining a real stimulus to their faith and practice. They liked the sermon while it lasted ; it was pleasant and instructive at the moment, and then it was gone like a dream when one awoke from sleep. In another address on 'The New Teaching' he deals with two books, each of which has greatly influenced him. The first is 'Christ's Message of the Kingdom,' by Professor A. G. Hogg, and published by Messrs. T. & T. Clark for 2s. 'I really do not know,' he writes, 'how any man can better spend fifteen weeks of reading-time than by the perusal of this modest little volume.' 'Fifteen weeks is the time the author asks, and he knows very well what he is about.' Mr. Hoyle made the test, so that he knew the author was within the mark. We pass on his recommendation. The second book is 'The Nature and Purpose of Christian Society,' by T. R. Glover. 'There is plenty in it, and nobody will find out how much there *is* in it until he has given to it about the same space of time Professor Hogg asks for his book.'

Some Minor Characters in the New Testament (Hodder & Stoughton ; 6s. net) is a new work by that well-known New Testament scholar, Professor A. T. Robertson of the Baptist Theological Seminary, Louisville. The chapters contained in it have appeared already in various religious journals. The characters passed under review are Nicodemus, Andrew, Herod the Great, Caiaphas, Pilate, Mary Magdalene, Epaphras, Gamaliel, and ten or twelve others, including 'Felix the Grafter' and the two members of 'the first Ananias Club.' Contrary to the expectations which these two descriptive titles might raise, the papers consist for the most part of plain and unvarnished expositions of the Biblical references, but illustrated now and then from contemporary life and conditions. The preacher will find in this work a useful and reliable expository basis for his sermons on New Testament characters. The theological standpoint is, when it appears, conservative.

Is Christianity a real social force ? It is, says Mr. Edward M'Lellan in the last Hartley Lecture, *Jesus the Reformer* (Holborn Publishing House ; 5s. net). It is, and it always has been, and it has never been more so than to-day. The writer surveys history up to to-day from this standpoint and contends that man has it in him to rise above adverse conditions, that none of the other religions of the world can really lift him up, that the Christian religion can, and that Jesus alone is the hope of the world. These are large generalizations, but the writer supports them by sound argument, and both his earnestness and his knowledge help to make his argument persuasive. It is a good book into which wide reading and clear thinking have gone to make it good.

Every student of Hebrew knows, or ought to know, something of his debt to Gesenius, to whom 'belongs the distinction of having begun a lexicon that maintained its supremacy for over a hundred years.' These words are taken from Dr. Edward Frederick Miller's *Influence of Gesenius on Hebrew Lexicography* (Milford; 7s. 6d. net), a work which carefully discusses his lexicographical principles, traces his Manual Lexicon through the successive editions of Dietrich, Mühlau and Volck, and Buhl, Socin, and Zimmern, briefly discusses the merits of Hebrew-English Lexicons based on Gesenius, and concludes with an extensive bibliography. One gets from this interesting volume an impression of the uncertainty—especially before the advent of Assyriology—that attaches to the nature and origin of Hebrew roots. Gesenius was among those who ever keep the open mind and approach fresh facts without prejudice. The technical discussion is preceded by a brief sketch of his life which reveals him as a man of attractive nature and indefatigable industry, though hardly a profoundly religious person.

Apart from 'synonoymous' (p. 9) and 'accute' (p. 21) there is one amusing misprint on p. 16, where we are told that Gesenius 'began his first lexicon when he was *repentent*, at Goettingen, in the winter of 1806–07.' It should of course be *Repetent*. There is also an awkward chronological slip on p. 15. 'Robinson tells us that he was present at Gesenius' opening lecture on Genesis, in 1808. Nineteen years before, when he began at Halle, he had only fourteen students in his class. . . . Now he had five hundred.' As Gesenius was born in 1786 (1785, according to Cheyne, *Founders of O.T. Criticism*, p. 54), he would thus have begun to lecture when he was three years of age—which were precocity indeed. Gesenius was not only a mighty scholar, but an amazingly popular teacher, over a thousand students attending his two classes annually; and it is fitting that the memory of the man as well as of his work should be kept alive by this book, which rests upon wide and painstaking investigation in out-of-the-way sources.

Under the appropriate title *Six Great Anglicans*—Charles Simeon, John Keble, Walter Farquhar Hook, F. W. Robertson, Charles Kingsley, and Samuel A. Barnett—the Rev. Canon F. W. Head, M.C., B.D., has published a series of lectures on Pastoral Theology, delivered last year in the University of Cambridge (S.C.M.; 6s. net). The lives of these outstanding clergymen cover rather more than the period of last century. There is not a page in the volume that is not worth reading. The lectures were delivered to candidates for ordination. It was the desire of Canon Head to make these parish priests live again as worthy examples for their successors of to-day, and he has succeeded. It is in every sense a far cry from Charles Simeon and John Keble in the earlier years of last century to Canon Barnett in his labours amid the appalling conditions of East London in its last decade, but Canon Head in every instance shows an accurate knowledge of the different circumstances of time and place, together with a sane and unbiased judgment.

It is difficult to say which of these half-dozen lectures is the best of the series, but we should give the prize to that dealing with Robertson of Brighton. 'What has he to teach us?' the writer asks. 'Chiefly, I think, the tremendous importance of preaching in the work of the Christian ministry,' is his answer. 'There is great hunger now as then for a real message.'

The Rt. Rev. G. K. A. Bell, D.D., Bishop of Chichester, has written a useful little book, solid and informative, entitled *A Brief Sketch of the Church of England* (S.C.M.; 4s. net). Dr. Bell's zeal for the Church he serves so ably is well known, as also his tolerance and fair-mindedness, and many beyond the Anglican communion will read his pages with interest and profit. The volume begins happily by drawing a parallel between ecclesiastical and architectural development: 'the Church of England, like Canterbury Cathedral, is a succession of buildings.' Then the successive 'buildings' are rapidly sketched, from the structure founded by Augustine to that raised by the Reformers. The character of the Church of England as 'comprehensive' is then clearly brought out. The chapters that follow treat of the Prayer Book, the Bishop, the Parish Priest, and the Representative Assemblies. The meaning of 'establishment' is described with great care, and the character of what would be involved in 'disestablishment' tentatively set forth. The concluding chapters deal with Church Property, the Lambeth Conference, and the relations of the Anglican with other Christian Communions. A book that describes the Enthronement of the present Archbishop of Canterbury and contains the programme of the Lambeth

Conference of 1930 is obviously up to date. A book which terminates on this note is clearly in touch with the spirit of the age: 'It is certain that the desire for unity is deeper than it has ever been, and that the fellowship which so surely grows between the Church of England and other Christian communions in faith and hope and love will find more and more its true outward and visible expression.'

The Secret of the African, by Mr. Edwin W. Smith (S.C.M.; 3s. 6d. net), is a series of seven lectures on African religion. Mr. Smith has shown in his previous writings, notably 'The Golden Stool,' his intimate knowledge of African life and his keen sympathy with the African. His present book deals mainly with the African's awareness of God, with chapters treating of magic and spiritism, and an estimate of the strength and weakness of African religion. He has deliberately dwelt on the highest and best, and has striven to show what elements of belief there are in the native mind waiting to respond to the gospel. The book is written in an interesting and popular style, and is well fitted to act as an introduction to the study of African religion.

In *Seekers and Saints: Studies of Religious Experience*, by Mr. W. J. Ferrar (S.P.C.K.; 6s. net), the author gives us a series of unconnected essays on noted, and in some cases unnoted, figures in the religious world. They are all interesting, and the point of special interest is that many of them are more or less unfamiliar to the ordinary reader, who will be glad to hear of them from so competent an instructor. The book begins with the Hymn of Cleanthes, and both in this study and in others we have an informing exposition of Stoicism at its best. Then we have 'Lake Orta and S. Guilio,' 'The Homilies of St. Macarius,' 'The Great Days of St. Martin de Tours,' 'St. Malachy of Armagh,' and a few others better known, such as George Fox. It will be seen that there is nothing hackneyed in this book. The reader will be pleasantly occupied in adding to his knowledge of many byways of religious history. This is distinctly a book for the book-lover.

The United Council for Missionary Education is doing a real service to the cause of Christian missions by the publication, through the medium of the Student Christian Movement, of the series of biographies of those men and women of the past who may fittingly be called the heroes and heroines of the mission fields. The latest is *Thomas Birch Freeman: The Son of an African*, 'the greatest pioneer missionary West Africa has ever known,' as Mr. F. Deaville Walker describes him (5s. net). Mr. Walker, who has already given proof of his skill in his biography of William Carey, tells us that his fairly exhaustive researches have shown Freeman to be an even greater man than he had previously supposed; and yet outside the ranks of Methodism, from which this remarkable man emerged, the son of an African father and an English mother, how many know anything of his truly heroic work among the savage natives of the Gold Coast and Ashanti nearly a century ago? They have read more about Sir Garnet Wolseley and his military expedition against the Ashantis and the capture of their capital Kumasi. What a very different story is that told in this volume of the capture of king and capital of that savage military race by the amazing heroism and unconquerable persistence of this brave soldier of the Cross! Thomas Freeman was the first white man who had ever led an expedition through the almost impenetrable forest and dared to present himself unarmed before a heathen monarch with all his armed chieftains around him. There is nothing in fiction to surpass the chapters in this book, 'Through the Forest to Kumasi' and 'Received by the Ashanti King,' descriptive of the adventure of this young missionary of twenty-nine. Like other pioneers, Thomas Freeman had often greater difficulties to overcome among the Christians than those he conquered among the heathen on the Gold Coast.

An excellent book on how to teach religion, and especially the Christian religion, to children has been written by the Rev. H. W. Fox, D.S.O., M.A., *The Child's Approach to Religion* (Williams & Norgate; 3s. 6d. net). Mr. Fox begins with a description of his own religious education, which will be recognized by many as their own experience. Then, in a series of letters to a parent, he tells how a child should be initiated into the elements of religious faith. It is all sound, beginning with Jesus and leading on to a true idea of God. The Old Testament is kept till well on in the process, as it should be, and there are many penetrating counsels on things to be said and done, and things not to be either said or done. No better book of general guidance could be found for the parent or teacher than this unpretending little volume. It will do much good wherever it goes.

The Church as the Home of the Spiritual Life.

By the Reverend J. Emrys Morgan, B.A., B.D., Darwen, Lancs.

The Christian Church is a tremendous fact in the history of the world. Every fact needs an interpretation. It deserves and demands an explanation, for it is still true, as Huxley said, that 'we have to sit down before a fact like a little child, or we shall learn nothing.' Both critics and champions of the Church have to bear this in mind. Whether the fact be palatable or provocative, it is still a fact, and the existence of the Church for so long a period is worthy of fair and just consideration.

'It will,' says Dr. Glover, 'be hard to say what can mean anything to us if nineteen centuries of the intensest life of the most living part of the world are to go for nothing' (*Christian Tradition*, etc.). Every great effect must have an adequate cause. Such a society as the Church must be accounted for, even though men rummage among the heaps of mythology, or apply the theories of psychology, or study the practices of the Mystery religions. True enough, the Church is not one outwardly. The idea of unity is hovering over her and has not yet set its foot on the earth. The many sects and divisions of Christendom are bewildering to the average man. Yet amid all these, the question presses on the attention of every thoughtful person: 'Why is there such a thing as a Christian Church?' 'What can account for the emergence and persistence of such a society?' There is no escape from that question. Repeated evasions only mean its ultimate resurrection.

What we know as the Church is traced back to an historical person—Jesus Christ. Plainly He had something to do with it directly or indirectly. The most careful and protracted analysis comes to that in the end, even if the conclusion reached by some minds be that He was not the actual founder. If He did not found it, then it must have been created by men who came under His influence. The Apocalyptic School say that He did no such thing. His mind was so occupied with the coming end of the world that the idea of a Church, to modern thought, is absurd. Paul, and others of like mind, must have been fired with the notion that an institution called the Church would be a good thing, and they set about it. But then, why did they think it would be a good thing?

Dr. Gore maintains that there was no need to found a Church. It was already in existence. There was an Israel of God, and what He did was to refound and renew it, and equip it with apostles as authoritative officers, who were essential to its permanence, and thus he works on to apostolical succession and the episcopate. 'We must confess,' he says, 'that it was the episcopate, and the principle of apostolical succession, which saved the unity of the Church as far as it was saved' (*Holy Spirit and the Church*). It was the form, order, system that saved the Church, not the robustness of her faith or the strength of her conviction—her system, not her spirit. Harnack says: 'The cause of the marvellous growth of the early Church lay not in her apostles, apologists, or martyrs, but in the faithful daily life of the average common Christian.' Dr. Gore further says that 'there is really nothing in the N.T. to support the idea that any Church had the right to elect and appoint its own officers *without the intervention of the apostles*.' But Williston Walker says in reference to bishops and presbyters: 'They were chosen by the Church, or at least with the consent of the whole Church.'

After reading Dr. Gore, I turned to a book from which I have derived much, *The Ideal of Jesus* (W. N. Clarke), and found it very refreshing. Perhaps others will find his chapter on 'The Church' equally corrective and effective. 'He' (Jesus), says Dr. Clarke, 'was leaving in the world a life to be lived. Vast formal institutions have gathered around Him, but they cannot look to Him for their original inspiration. Simple and flexible structure must belong to an organization that represents the living Jesus. Any body that claims to be the only authorized representative of Christianity is ignoring facts concerning other bodies.'

Controversialists will no doubt for long delight in discussing the use and growth of the Christian Church, but we need not now pursue that aspect of the case. The main fact for us is that the Church centres in Christ, and she exists to testify to the abiding reality of Christ. He gave a new life. He gathered a group of men around Him and breathed into them an extraordinary something not known before. There was formation of character before the institution of a Church. This life or character had to adopt some means to protect and propagate itself. It could not live in a void. It had to weave a garment for itself, and thus we find no difficulty in believing that a Christian society came into existence, directly traceable to Jesus Christ, dependent on Him, moulded and guided by His mind and spirit and convinced of His presence. A society that has continued throughout and survived the vicissitudes of history must have a purpose, and it is in the light of its purpose, and not merely of its form and system, the Church ought to be considered.

The purpose is indicated in the subject: 'The Church as the Home of the Spiritual Life.' What do we mean by the Spiritual Life? Volumes have been written on it, which doubtless have enlarged and enriched our ideas. Still, every man has to face the question for himself, 'What is the Spiritual Life?' As far as we know it, at any rate, it is not dissociated from physical and material forms. Man is spirit and has a body. There is some vital force within him, which he recognizes as himself. He knows that his real self is invisible though it does and must reveal itself in diverse ways and manners. That is a bedrock of reality to every man, whatever he may make of it. And this vital force within, the self or spirit, has qualities, tendencies, disposition, desires, and aspirations. Words cannot express all that it is, and means, and wants. It escapes our formulas and definitions. 'Spirit is a name given by philosophy to that part of us, which has certain desires, which are not desires of the flesh' (Clutton Brock). The spirit is the man, and is rich in, and full of, experiences, characteristics, and relationships. Spirit is that within us which is most akin to God, and has the capacity to commune with God.

> Great armfellow of God
> To the ancestral clod
>   Kin,
> And to Cherubin.

While the gospel of Christ pertains to the whole man, and is a gospel for the body as well as the spirit, and while it reminds us that if a man is to be saved at all he must be saved as a whole, the fact remains that Jesus directed His creative and constructive genius to man's spirit. What He brought into being was a new quality of spirit, and when that happens it pervades the whole of man's nature. He then makes the greatest of discoveries—the discovery of self.

The prime function of the Church, then, is the care and culture of the spirit, which is in man. She does not enhance her reputation by becoming a mere club, or a competitor in the provision of amusements. She will gain more respect when she sticks to her business and remembers that 'religion is her speciality.' It is as centres of worship, teaching, and inspiration, the Churches will best serve modern times. No better description of a Church can be given than 'a home.' For that we have Scriptural warrant—'The household of God,' 'the household of faith.' 'Home' is a word of sweetest import to the heart of man. If by some means we could convince the man outside that the Church is meant to be and really is a home, where he will have his share of fair play, friendship, and freedom, what an impetus it would be to the Kingdom of God! Now what are the desires, even the demands, of the spiritual life? Life has its necessities, and its highest form, spirit, cannot be devoid of them. The spiritual life breaks out in many forms. It tries to express itself in various ways.

1. *Its First Demand is Fellowship.*—Spirit cannot realize itself apart from society. The freedom of the spirit is not an unconditioned, unrelated spirit, because every spirit, at least every spirit that dwells in this world, must exist in relation to society. Modern times have found that there is a wonderful fascination in fellowship, if one is to judge by the host of fellowships which exist.

It is well to remember that this is the legacy of the gospel to the twentieth century. The sound of fellowship (*κοινωνία*) is heard throughout the New Testament. In THE EXPOSITORY TIMES, xxxv. 567, Professor Anderson Scott says that 'fellowship was the earliest self-designation which the Christian community adopted.' We also have it on good authority that 'the name "Church" was very early adopted by the Christian body.' Thus fellowship was a marked characteristic of the followers of Jesus, and it impressed observers, as is shown by Pliny's famous letter to the Emperor Trajan in A.D. 112. The band of twelve disciples, after all is said and done, is the most illuminating example of fellowship in history. It is even an interesting study in psychology! The Upper Room is a symbol of the same thing. We are told that the evidence of the catacombs *re* the manner of celebrating the Lord's Supper shows striking signs of brotherhood, since slaves and women reclined at the Agape and Eucharist like their masters. These pictures of fellowship are significant and stimulating to us. There was the bond of a common life, and it was Christ. And the Church has fostered a phase of life which is being increasingly recognized in our time. Man will draw towards his fellows, and the group, or the crowd, is receiving an attention to-day which possibly it never received before.

We must also remember that a man is not the same in a crowd. Something is added to, or subtracted from, him. His individuality remains, but the mass or the crowd reacts on him. Fellowship is a grand and Divine thing, but it needs nurture like every phase of the spiritual life. The coinage of fellowship may be easily debased, as the street corner, the pavement, the drinking club, and the gaming or betting room have shown. The Church exists to rehabilitate fellowship on the widest possible scale, and make it a power for righteousness and the joy of all the earth.

'The Gospel began with fellowship,' says Dr. Glover. It is a beautiful remark—and true. It began in a sane and human way on common-sense lines, and whatever may pass away, friendship and fellowship will not. Above every other agency in the world the Church is entrusted with the care and culture of fellowship. Her passion for fellowship is the most convincing proof to the world that she really believes in a Divine Fatherhood.

Churches are not always careful enough in the matter of extending a welcome to strangers. Such a lack makes a deeper impression than we think. It makes all the difference in the world when there is a Barnabas, the man with the hospitable heart, to take a stranger by the hand and lead him into the circle of believers and inquiring souls.

2. *Another Demand of the Spiritual Life is Understanding.*—The spirit in man has an intellectual activity. It inquires and investigates. The search for truth never ceases. In this connexion Dr. Dearmer and Bishop Gore may be aptly quoted.

Dearmer: 'The strongest appeal of the Church, at least before the Constantinian era, had been to the Intellectual side of those who witnessed its worship.' *Gore:* 'The man of an inquiring mind would have found in the early Church a very liberal temper of toleration—the lover of freedom in the Church in the first four centuries, though he would have found certain broad limits laid down, would have been left with plenty of room to move within those limits.'

This helps to correct the notion that the Christians of long ago were enthusiasts with no enlightenment—a body of emotional people with no stability. As the home of the spiritual life, the Church must be a centre of learning. It is not without meaning that the term 'disciples' was given to the early followers of Jesus.

'Disciple' in its Latin and Greek forms means 'a learner.' Though we live in a world that is supposed to be well-informed there is always room for the learner. During the last century the world has climbed to a new intellectual outlook. In Science, History, and Philosophy, new methods have been followed. What is needed to-day is a combination of mental vigour and devotion. The type once referred to by Phillips Brooks—'There are Christians who fear to bring their minds to bear on religion lest their hearts should lose their hold on it'—is not likely to add much to the strength of the Church. The Christian learner will 'press toward the mark,' and will realize that all true thought must lead not away from, but to Him who is the truth. He will welcome a fresh revelation of God in every advance of knowledge. Living is largely learning, and it is true even now that we only know in part. The laws of life and the great values of life are not mastered in a day. The meaning of faith and love and sacrifice comes but slowly to most men, and we have to read them afresh in every new situation.

'Son of man, stand on thy feet, and I will speak to thee.' That call still comes to us. Inspiration does not wait on indolence. Readiness and receptivity are essential to revelation.

There are many misconceptions of the Bible, of God and Christ, of man, and the uses and purposes of life, and the Church is honour bound in the name of Him who said, 'Learn of me,' to help and guide the human spirit in its inquiry and desire for satisfaction. The Church is told to do all sorts of things to-day, but she must not forget instruction, or fail to create an atmosphere that encourages learning in the highest things. One fears that in many of our Sunday Schools anything and everything is read, except that which truly edifies and brings the young within reach of the Master of life.

Life is a big thing for all of us. Christ is greater than all systems put together, and in Him we have plenty of scope to learn.

A living writer says of Robertson of Brighton: 'He brought to his age the living message of a man upon whom the best light of his age had shone.'

Has not the Church to do that still?

3. *Two Other Characteristics of the Spiritual Life are Appreciation and Appropriation.*—The spirit within us has the capacity to appreciate, and it wants to appropriate. Worship is appreciation, and there can be no appreciation without mediation and communion. It has been said that 'worship is applause in its highest form'—certainly a novel way of putting it, that is alien to our customary methods. Be that as it may, worship in the last analysis is appreciation of the Highest and Best. If we know anything of the love and power of God in Christ; if we are conscious of the suggestions and promptings of His spirit; we shall

appreciate these benedictions and seek to express our appreciation.

Worship is an appreciation of the Headship and Lordship of Jesus Christ, of the imperishable worth of His personality, and it is a vital matter to keep alive the sense of appreciation of the Divinest life that ever appeared in human form. 'Whenever,' says Glover, 'the Church at large or any church in particular has committed itself to any scheme of thought which has lessened the significance of Jesus Christ, it has declined.'

Amid all the charges and counter-charges which the Church and the world bring against one another, one thing stands out, viz. that the Founder of the Church gave men an Ideal of life, with which no other can be compared. Appreciation of that Ideal is a necessity, and in her worship and work the Church does try to maintain it. Every true home has an atmosphere of gratitude and appreciation, and the Church should excel all other societies and institutions in fostering the sense that recognizes truth, goodness, and beauty in whatever forms they come. If cynicism and pessimism had their way, they would hand the world over to the devil. It is for the Church of the living God to welcome every boon and blessing that comes through science, enterprise, education, or social activity. Ugliness and misery are common enough, but it is the peculiar privilege of the Church to welcome whatsoever things are true, honest, just, etc. The worship of God is the one factor that keeps men sensitive to the duties and sanctities of life.

Then the spirit in man *wants to appropriate*. That characteristic is clear and indisputable. Who can measure the cravings of the human spirit, or describe the ways in which it seeks satisfaction? It has been said that 'Divine Worship is right living.' None of us will question the doctrine. But, again, the Church as a home should help men to realize that, and convert the principle into practice. The cost of abandoning the belief that a lofty character is possible is fatal to the Church. She would then cease to be a Church. Her foundation is personality, and her mission to bring personality to fruition in men and women. 'We are his workmanship, his poem.' 'You are God's harvest field.' 'You are God's building.'

We must ever remember that the one indictment of Militarism, Mammonism, and other pernicious '-isms' is that they flout and ignore personality. Man feels that he is of no account as a moral being, he is simply a unit for devilish ends. The Church as a home should be the indomitable protectress of high character.

During the war, Professor Gilbert Murray said: 'We have been given everything except a certain necessary greatness of character. That seems lacking at any rate among the present rulers of Europe. We have had it in abundance in the past, and probably we have the material for it now.' Yes, we believe we have the material for it now, and the Church is called to mete out justice to it and mould it in the right way.

If, then, a lofty type of character is possible, if personality can be attained, the human spirit can appropriate more and more of the life of God. 'The Spirit of man is the candle of the Lord.' Man is an appropriator of power, and the Church can give him a favourable opportunity in a congenial environment to take in more and more of the righteousness, joy, peace, and love, which constitute the 'Kingdom of God.'

It was written long ago: 'Ye shall receive power.' The Church is still dependent on that promise, and she seeks the power through prayer and faith. Prayer is her great means of appropriation. Behind a flower of the field, a daisy or a primrose, are the resources of the vast universe. The flower draws upon them in order to live and propagate itself. It assimilates the power resident in soil, and sun, wind and rain, and surely what a flower is endowed with is not denied to man.

His capacity to appropriate is no chance affair, but a deep-seated element in his moral and spiritual constitution. If God gives, as the Christian revelation teaches, we can accept and appropriate. In a home a person's receptivity is at its highest.

4. *Reconciliation—that, again, is a Necessity of the Spiritual Life.*—The differences in men's views, opinions, theories, and methods are nothing compared with the difference in the spirit they manifest. The Elder Brother was as far removed from his father in spirit as the younger was in space—and farther. Systems are often but signs of the spirit which divides men. They will not give in; they will not give and take; they will persist in cherishing the grudge or harbouring the evil intent. In the last count it is the dominating spirit that pulls down or builds up a parish, a community, or a nation. However, the Church stands for a new society of brotherly men, and in their best moments people are driven to yearn for that. There is evidence in our time that the desire is real. A Christian Order in Industry and Commerce—the League of Nations—Copec. The Ideal of Reconciliation is pressing on the souls of men to-day, and it is a hopeful sign.

Of course we are confronted with the old notion that dies very hard, that 'human nature does not change.' What, then, is the use of talking of progress? Of what avail is it to praise and commend virtues like brotherhood, justice, and love? It is a commonplace of Christian experience that men do change. The Church stands for change—change of mind and heart—and her philosophy has not had the bottom knocked out of it yet. If men cannot be made new at this time of day, we may cease to talk of civilization. There is nothing before us but stark barbarism.

To build up life in accord with the law of love is the biggest problem of all. It is a gigantic task, but if the Church is not to betray her trust she must proclaim that message and lend her inspiration to all who attempt it.

We should like to believe with Wordsworth that 'man is dear to man.' It does not always seem to be so. On many occasions we wait in vain for the verification of the sentiment. But indisputably 'man is dear to man' when both meet in Christ. It was He who brought together Matthew the Publican and Simon the Zealot and made them blend, and that was as stiff a task as can be imagined, for one was an official of the hated Roman government, and the other a fierce Nationalist. Amid the diversions and contentions, the strifes and scrambles of the modern world, the basis of our comfort and confidence is that in Jesus Christ is 'the irresistible beauty of an example,' of reconciling power, which we know is urgently needed to-day. The Church has to nourish and cherish that as her most treasured possession. If she does not, I for one cannot believe that any human institution will preserve it for long. And so, as Dr. Dearmer says: 'There is nothing on the remotest horizon that can take the place of the Church—in her worship prejudice is more easily convicted, variety more readily allowed, individualism more widely acknowledged, and fellowship more deeply enjoyed.' If it be permissible to substitute the words 'Church' for 'nature,' and 'spirit' for 'sense' in Wordsworth's lines on Tintern Abbey, I would say:

> Well pleased to recognize
> In nature and the language of the sense
> The anchor of my purest thoughts, the nurse,
> The guide, the guardian of my heart, and soul
> Of all my moral being.

'We are this house of God, if we will only keep confident and proud of our hope' (Moffatt).

In the Study.

Virginibus Puerisque.

Poking the Fire.

By the Reverend John Macbeath, M.A., Glasgow.

'Stir up the gift of God, which is in thee.'—2 Ti 1[6].

One of the most uncommon gifts I have ever received was the gift of a poker. It was given to me by a man who worked with steel plates and steel rods, and he had made this poker out of a cold steel rod. The handle end of the poker was the neatly turned and twisted rod in the shape of a bowler's knot. I wonder if you know what kind of a knot that is! Have you ever watched sailors knotting the ship's ropes? Could you make these knots and give them their proper names? My poker handle is a bowler's knot!

This is the time of year when the poker becomes a favourite in the house, and we learn to

> Sing a Song of Seasons,
> Something bright in all:
> Flowers in the summer,
> Fires in the fall.

There are not many of us who don't like to poke the fire. The poker becomes the hardest working member of the family.

'Punch' once wrote some letters to his son. In one of them he gave this advice, 'My boy, be a bright poker!' I suspect that 'Punch' had more than one poker at his fireside. He had an ornamental one. It never was soiled, because it never did any work. It just remained in its place, perhaps in its stand to be looked at, and be caressed by the duster. In its very self-respecting polish, the bright poker belonged to the aristocracy, the nobility of the fireside.

The other poker was a stubby little fellow who lay, ready for use, inside the fender. Modestly out of sight of the visitors, only the person who had the right to poke the fire knew where to find it. When the fire was dull the little poker stirred it up to sparkling life and burning flame, filling the room with a cheery glow. Raking out the dead ashes and putting the coal in order, the poker was a useful member of the family.

The bright poker was an idle poker; it never stirred the fire. The working poker was a household favourite.

There was another letter written by a man to his son, at any rate he called him his 'son in the faith,' and he, too, said something about poking the fire. He wrote to the younger person, saying, 'Stir up the gift of God, which is in thee!'

I wonder if that young life was letting his mind go to sleep! Perhaps he was not doing his utmost, not putting forth all his power. The fire was dull and low, lots of dead ashes in the grate. It was burning sluggishly and needed poking, 'stirring up' as he called it.

Stir up your energy, he seemed to say, stir up your will, increase your application. Rouse yourself to greater earnestness and greater diligence. Don't be lazy, don't be dull, don't be slothful, don't even be uselessly shy! Poke the fire!

I heard the other day of a man who wanted to be a philosopher. So he got some books and sat all morning yawning and poking the fire, and he thought himself a very finished philosopher. But he put the poker in the wrong fire. His life was dull inside; his mind was in a sleepy condition. He needed his mental state stirred up.

Some one once told me of a woman who was seen going down the street one day with a poker in her hand. When she was asked where she was going, she replied that she was 'going to the front.' 'But what can you do at the front with a poker?' inquired the friend. The eager woman answered, 'I may not be able to do very much, but I'll let them know what side I'm on.' Her gifts of perception and of patriotism and courage and devotion were stirred up. Some people never know what side they are on. They never think much about it, and they don't care. They seem to walk in their sleep. They don't quite know where they are.

But if we are ever going to be any good, or do any good in the world, we've got to rouse ourselves to keen interest and eager application. We've got to know what side we're on, and we've got to make our being on that side worth while to everybody, even to God Himself.

Stir up your gift, your mind, your will, your prayers. Poke your own fire!

The Periscope.

By the Reverend S. Greer, M.A., Ayr.

'Cleanse first that which is within the cup.'—Mt 23[26].

Have you ever seen one of those strange craft called submarines, with its decks awash, and its eyes at the top of that queer little tube called a periscope? The officer on watch sits below in the dark, looking in at the bottom of the periscope, and seeing out at the top; for the mirror below reflects what the mirror at the top-end sees, so that, even if the boat is submerged out of sight, he can watch all that is happening on the surface. There goes a little fishing-boat, and there a mighty liner steaming majestically by—all come and go in that magic mirror. If you had a periscope at home, how handy it would be for looking over obstacles, and round corners, and seeing through stone walls, as our soldiers did in France!

But indeed, while the periscope is a new way of seeing through walls, it is a long time since mothers and sisters learned how to see through small boys—and that's a much harder thing. How is it, I used to wonder, that they always knew when one had been in trouble or in mischief? You would come into the room whistling softly to show how composed you were, or you tried to get away quietly to bed; but they brought you back, a few questions were put to you, and the whole wretched story was out. How did they ever guess? Ah!—the periscope! There are two or three of them we all carry around with us, and folk have learned how to use them to look into our hearts. You had better get acquainted with these, for you never know when somebody is sizing you up.

For example, there's that little pair of mirrors, our eyes. Nothing tells more of what is going on inside our minds than they do. Here is a boy brazening out a falsehood, and all the time the fear of being found out is lurking in his eyes. (I think 'lie' is the ugliest word in the language, don't you?—and a lie the ugliest thing.) 'What a sneak he looks!' said one lad to another in my hearing, and looking round I had no difficulty in detecting the boy whom they were discussing. For, somehow, character peeps out at the eyes. There are shifty eyes, and furtive eyes, and the eyes of the fellow who can always be depended upon to let you down. You have seen people whose lips were smiling, but their eyes were not, and you knew they were not really happy or pleased; it was only a mask they were wearing. And there are young folks whose clear, frank, fearless gaze mirrors the soul of honour within—all fair and square and above-board. How wonderful must have been the eyes of Jesus!

Another periscope is our manners. I don't mean the kind of thing you put on with your party clothes, or when there's company at home. But the sort of person you show yourself every day. Are you one of those boys who must always be getting their own way, or else everybody hears about it? When you and your little brother are playing with your Meccano, you've got to get the spanner at once, and the rivets have a way of getting into your pocket! Or, when there's an errand to run for mother, do you grouse because you have to leave the hero of your thrilling story in such a fix that you doubt whether he will be still alive when you get back? Or are you one of those folk who have learned not to be a selfish creature, but to give and take, and be a 'sport,' and keep whistling even when your luck is all out? A great writer tells us that 'manners are the shadows of virtues,' and in those daily manners of yours, as in a mirror, people see something which is very deep down in your heart.

And then, I should like to know what a girl or boy thinks funny. A very clever man once said that was an excellent way to judge people. What they laugh at tells us a great deal about them. How many different kinds of laughter there are! There's the clear, joyous laugh of sheer merriment—some of the most gladsome music in the world. There's the coarse laugh of the little wretch who is ill-treating a cat or dog. There's the shame-faced laugh at something that is not nice, and there's the cruel, mocking laugh which leaves a wound behind, for it is at somebody else's expense. I have known a fellow turn absolutely sick at something which set a score of others laughing. He couldn't see the joke; he couldn't see that there was a joke in what was demeaning to his manhood.

So you see that through many periscopes we are daily giving curious views of ourselves, and of all that is going on in our hearts. Now somebody is saying to himself, 'I must be careful not to give myself away!' But that is surely to start at the wrong end of the periscope. Jesus once spoke about people who were very careful about what folk thought of them. 'Cleanse first that which is within,' He said to them, 'that the outside may be clean also.' Let our hearts and minds be filled with loyalty to Him, and cleansed of evil, and those many mirrors we carry about with us will not put us to shame.

The Christian Year.

Twenty-fifth Sunday after Trinity.

The Severity of the Divine Love.

'He was clothed with a vesture dipped in blood: and his name is called The Word of God.'—Rev 19[13].

When Christ's life was ended and His Cross was past, men knew more than ever before about the tenderness of the Love Divine, but they knew more about its severity also. Here is an instance of this line of thinking which startles the mind into attention. The Word of God is pictured riding forth across the world to claim a Kingdom, but he rides sword in hand and in blood-stained apparel. This is poetry; if it is turned into prose, this theme emerges—the severity, we might almost say the cruelty, of the Divine Love. An excellent commentary upon this idea is afforded by a visit to any historical museum where the past is vividly reflected, and where relics are preserved of the struggles, sorrows, and triumphs of humanity. Such places compel the question—Did ever any great idea ride across the earth—any idea which stirred the hearts of men and shook the ancient foundations—without its garments being sooner or later dipped in blood? It is necessary in such a connexion to think not only of the sufferings of those who have set new causes in motion—the prophets of truth, the pioneers of progress. It is necessary to include in the survey all the restlessness and pain introduced by such causes into the world, whether among friends or opponents, the price of progress paid not by one side only, the agony of division coming like a sword into the life of families and nations, the wreckage of the innumerable battles between ideals and realities. Men are told that the world is planned by wisdom and love: that is our faith, and it may not be an altogether unreasoning or unreasonable faith. But, even if it be so, the wisdom and the love often seem strangely cruel.

There is a principle which seems to be inwrought with the scheme of things, and from which, however much we may dislike it, we cannot altogether escape. It may be roughly summarized in two phrases, the first, that Nature is hard upon life, and the second, that God is hard upon man. Nature is hard upon life. Science has taught us that lesson with tremendous reiteration and limitless illustration till we are weary of hearing it.

The second phrase is borrowed from a wise theologian who adds this as his explanation: 'Every finer vision of God has come with new demands upon men.' In other words, the severity of the Divine Love is apparent, not only in the broader realm of the natural world, but even in the more special and intimate realm of His grace. A hundred instances leap into the mind. Did God give easy days and years to a man like Moses? Nay, He was hard upon the man. Did He give easy days and years to His servants the prophets?

He was hard upon them. He wounded them with the sharp two-edged sword that went out of His mouth so that we can still hear their cries and protests. He emptied their lives from vessel to vessel until it seemed as if there were for them no home, no rest, no continuing city.

1. All these things are focussed in this passage. They are gathered here into a great piece of literature because they were also illustrated in the Christ who stood behind the literature. Long before this the dreams of prophets had pictured not only the coming Deliverer but the price of His progress across the world—an immeasurable price, a crimson price. There was, for instance, that famous picture of the conqueror from the red land of Edom. This passage in Revelation seems to borrow from that in the Second Isaiah and sets forth a like conception. But Christianity itself, apart from any special passage in its literature, is shaped somewhat after this pattern. Some have been *repelled from Christianity* by this very quality—repelled from it either as a doctrine or as a discipline. Some are repelled from it *as a doctrine*. For however much some of its teachings may be restated to suit the modern mind—say the idea of election, or the message of retribution, or the whole set of ideas that centre in the Cross—there is no eliminating a certain stern and absolute element in the Christian conception of the Divine character, that God is as holy as He is good; that for Him good and evil are realities; that He is waging relentless war against all that is opposed to His will. The great controversy which some minds have with Christianity is not over any historical question or any problem which can be settled by documents or by evidence. It is that the Word of God comes to meet them in such imperious guise, as with a drawn sword and an uncompromising message. And if some are repelled by the sternness of the Christian doctrine, others are equally *repelled by the sternness of the Christian discipline*. They find it hard to blend with the idea of self-culture the Christian ideals of self-denial and self-conquest.

I saw Lord Love upon his galley pass
Westward from Cyprus: smooth as glass
The sea was all before him. . . . Ever and anon
As worked upon
By some familiar Fury, grasping a scourge . . .
He ran along the transtra, and did urge
The rowers, and striped
Their backs with blood; whereat they leaped
Like maddened hounds, and swept
The sea until it hissed.
Then I: . . .
'Lord Love, what means this cruelty?'
But he to me
Deigned no reply:
Only I saw his face was wet with tears
And he did look beyond and yet beyond.

Does it not seem as though the only Lord of Love whom the world has ever known treated His followers after that fashion? He bade them take up their cross, and if need be cut off a right hand or pluck out a right eye. Why should it be so? It does not quite answer the questions or silence the protests of the soul that the Lord of Love should 'look beyond and yet beyond,' as though hinting at future explanation. Why should not His terms be easier now? Why should He thrust His sword into the pride and self-will of His disciples, and tell them with such exceeding plainness that their death is their life?

2. In this Apocalyptic picture there are one or two things which help to nourish faith and patience.

The heart breaks into *Te Deum* at the sight of this, that even through the bloodstains on the Divine apparel and in spite of them it is possible to read the words 'Faithful and True.' The problematic and perplexing things in Christianity and in life ought not to shake us out of our natural healthy feelings that the universe is rational and that the great soul of the world is just.

Christianity seems all the more worthy of credence because in this matter of the bloodstains it is of one piece with the universe—because it contains within itself something of the tragic element which we find so widely and so constantly blended with experience.

Agony is not only summoned but sent. Agony is met by agony: the need of the humble is met by the sacrifice of the highest; the God who made the world is no stranger to the pain which has been interwoven with its life. Perhaps from this passage alone we could not be sure of this.

But the reader has only to turn the page to come upon another and complementary thought. Whether or not the author of this book meant them to be fused in his readers' minds, they have been joined without hesitation by Christian experience, because it knows the Christ of whom, in splendid symbolism and in poetry most worshipful, these glowing pages tell. We read in verses not far away about 'the blood of the Lamb.' Men might be afraid to leave the problem of the world's pain and wrong to a God who stood afar off, sublime and cold and pitiless. They need not be afraid to leave it to One who Himself has borne it and gathered the deepest depths of it unto His own heart.[1]

Sunday next before Advent.

Catholicity of Mind.

'I am made all things to all men, that I might by all means save some.'—1 Co 9[22].

It is said that the most powerful thing in the world is public opinion. Its powers can scarcely be exaggerated if it comes into full and unrestricted operation. Ultimately it is the basis of law and the sanction of conduct. Nevertheless, it cannot be said that public opinion must for ever override individual judgment, for it is itself the aggregation of individual convictions. A world in which there is no room for private thought and separate conclusion is a doomed world. Individuals, in practical affairs, do sometimes step out from the common mass of the great throng, and holding aloft new ideas, give lift and lead to new and nobler achievements.

But in this business of leadership—of going before, preparing the way, making paths straight for new discoveries and new inductions—deference must be paid to established faiths as the accepted common heritage of the world. To disregard them, or to set aside this heritage of common judgment, has ever been the way of retarded progress. So for all who are striving to serve their day and generation there is nothing more important to emphasize than *Catholicity of Mind.*

1. *Respect for other men's convictions.*—There must be respect for other men's convictions. Convictions, be it remembered, are moral judgments which men reach often only by painful effort and always with solemnity. Few men are willing lightly to abandon them. Not infrequently are they interwoven with the holiest traditions. They may be false, but they may also be considered precious; and for that cause alone there is laid upon us the responsibility to consider them with respect. Every conviction that has ever had sufficient power to move men to great issues, however false the later judgment of the world may have shown it to be, has unquestionably been based on facts that were once considered fundamental either in the nature of man or in the constitution of society, and has been solved by a process of logical reasoning which was then considered flawless and irrefragable. In not a few instances, indeed, convictions long exploded have been so girt about by human prejudice and that ingenuity which prejudice employs, that generations of repeated assaults have almost failed to let in the light. But not infrequently has the assault been more intolerant than the old prejudice itself, so that those who found refuge in the old belief have exhausted every ingenuity of defence and so delayed the desired consummation. One of the primary lessons which the young should learn is that which the experience of human conflict has clearly taught, namely, that before there can be liberty for new thought there must be deference paid to the older beliefs. Few men are ready without question to yield the little truth they hold, and not all men are capable of an easy acquisition of more truth than that which they already have.

This applies not only to beliefs but to prejudice. Nothing is more stubborn than prejudice. It persists long after reason is exhausted in the fight. And woe to the man who ruthlessly sets foot upon it. It takes many forms, it reveals itself in many phases. Sometimes it rears its head in nations, and then comes legislation against 'foreigners' and 'Orientals.' Sometimes it is purely personal, growing out of heredity, environment, tradition, or training. But in almost all forms and cases it is relentless and requires careful treatment. Prejudice, unguided and unguarded, certainly has an immense power for harm. It may even prove venomous to one who handles it roughly. But he is a bold man who tries to extract the teeth of a serpent. It is easier to charm the reptile! Patience will go further than passion; and in the long run it will triumph over prejudice. Human conventions, too, no less than human convictions, need our deference, if Truth is to win its way successfully.

2. *The real purpose of your own opinions.*—If it is essential to human progress that we should respect the views and prejudices and conventionalities of other men, we must needs also cherish for ourselves a broad and inclusive judgment. Truth is many-sided. It is important, then, that we should get the point of view of those who differ from us widely and even fundamentally. From three different spots in that delightful region called Snowdonia, we would get vastly different ideas of Snowdon. From one point it presents the appearance of a mighty eagle. From another, its sides are notched and scarred, gigantic and terrible, without the slightest suggestion of beauty. From the third point, you can see the mountain from foot to summit, set in a gorgeous framework of surrounding hills, presenting a picture of a vast and living thing floating in a

---

[1] J. M. E. Ross, *The Tree of Healing*, 208.

landscape that is liquid with rare beauty. And yet it is the same old mountain all the time. They who have viewed it from one side only know but a fraction of its reality. To *know* Snowdon is to climb. It is the same with truth. Most men see but a segment of it. This often leads them to think that what others see is really not the truth at all, because it is unlike anything that falls to the lot of their own particular observation.

Nor should we stop here. To obtain a catholic-mindedness we must seek to enter into the fullness of life ourselves. Only so can we hope to reach the heart of things. We must learn to look for something deeper than what appears on the surface of things. If we regard only the externals of human society we shall find that irreconcilable differences divide us and sunder us from real fellowship with one another. And our conclusions are made for weal or woe, for what we think of others determines our conduct towards them. But when we look deeper we reach another and safer conclusion. Wherever we discover man, no matter what may be the colour of his skin, the shape of his eyes or the formation of his skull, he turns with the same affection to father and mother, to wife and child, to brother and sister. Whither am I going? He has the same unconquerable impulse to walk with bare hushed feet in the presence of that great, infinite, spiritual, eternal Being who pervades all spaces, whose power made the universe, whose wisdom upholds it, and whose love alone can save it. So is there an element of good in every life, and some measure of Divine truth in every creed.

One of the greatest examples of Catholic-mindedness ever recorded is that which refers to St. Paul's sojourn at Athens. Whilst waiting for the coming of his fellow-disciples he made a tour of the great city, and his spirit was stirred to its depths by the idolatry which was everywhere apparent. But he did not allow his detestation to appear in word or act. On the contrary, he seized upon this very idolatry of the Greeks as the proof of a spiritual sense which had not yet found its true expression. St. Paul saw truth concealed under a gigantic error. What he sought was to release that truth that it might live to some purpose. To uncover truth is the surest way to reveal error.

3. *The place of intense personal conviction.*—Now all this patience, forbearance, sympathy, and breadth of judgment which we have been advocating are not incompatible with the most intense conviction. They may rather be symptoms of it. If ever the civilizations of the earth are to be blended into one great brotherhood of men over which the ensign of Jesus Christ is to float in triumph as the one supreme emblem of true religion for all nations and languages and tongues, it will be when men are ready to merge their differences, not because they are not true, but because in every creed there is precisely that bit of truth which needs a chance to live so that it may grow to know the larger Truth of Him in whom all fullness dwells, the Truth in which men will yet attain to their ideals. The reasons for this are patent. Catholic-mindedness opens the door of other minds, and the open door implies a hospitality in which friendship and healing are accomplished. England is the country of the open door. There may be perils in it, and for the general well-being wise statesmanship is needed. But the open door of the spirit is not attended by such perils. By a readiness to share the mind so that we may know what each is thinking we steadily gain new conclusions and save each other from narrow judgment.

Moreover, this method disarms resistance. If a man invites us to the sanctuary of his hearthstone, and then unfolds to us all that is most precious in the experiences and convictions of his life, is he likely to take offence at what we may unfold? What if we lead him on to nobler heights of vision than those which he has yet attained? What if we give him a glimpse of a spiritual beauty that he had scarcely conceived possible? Sympathy wins its way to the human soul when all else fails. The passions of war subside when the ensign of mercy is flung to the breeze.

There was a certain Indian chieftain who was feared by hosts of men. He was just about to go upon the war-path against the whites when, suddenly, he lost his little child. He sat down in his tepee a day and a night beside the body of his babe, gloomy and terrible. Then a missionary came with a little coffin bearing a message of heartfelt sympathy, and placed it on the ground before him. After an hour of bitter anguish the Indian rose and placed the little one in the missionary's coffin. Then he washed away the paint and laid aside the feathers which were the symbols of war, and dismissed his followers in peace. That simple act of understandingness had convinced him that the white man was his friend.

So it is the wide world over. It is this very spirit which prepares the way for truth to make triumphal entry into the minds and souls of men, and gives the promise of a fairer day when all races and classes of men shall dwell together in unity. In this spirit will Righteousness and Peace draw nigh and kiss each other.[1]

ADVENT SUNDAY.

Life's Middle Watches.

'And if he shall come in the second watch, or come in the third watch, and find them so [watching], blessed are those servants.'—Lk 12^{38}.

Beyond question the most striking feature of this parable is to be found in this verse, where our Lord adds a special blessing to those who are found watching in the second or third watches. Why single out these for His peculiar benediction? The reason is obviously this, that it was more difficult to be faithful then.

The tedium of the first watch was lightened by the memory of the day that was just gone and the hopes of a good rest when it was over. The darkness of the fourth watch was cheered by the rays of coming day. But those who were called to stand on guard during the second and third periods had a task more difficult. They were neither defended by the past nor inspired by the future. They were summoned from a couch warm with comfort, and were half drowsy with insufficient repose. They had to stand in the cold when the night was coldest; in the dark when the darkness was deepest.

It is a common saying that the beginning of a thing is its most critical part. 'Well begun is half done.' No doubt this is partly true. The beginning of any enterprise is full of difficulties; but it is not on that account fraught with danger. On the contrary, the greatness of the difficulties constitutes the smallness of the dangers. The very fact that the beginner has more problems to face makes him more careful, and the result is that he seldom fails then. A man's weakness becomes his strength because it throws him back upon himself, and we never know what is in us till our back is to the wall. Or better still, it may throw us back on God, and when a man stands there he can never fail.

1. Perhaps there was no time when it was more difficult to be a Christian than in the early years of Christianity, when to the hatred of the Jew was added the ridicule of the Greek and the intolerance of the Roman; when the philosopher said, 'What will this babbler say?' and the judge presented the young disciple with the awful alternative to 'Worship the Emperor' or 'Feed the lions.' Yet there was no time when Christian faith reached so high as then; when the Church went on from triumph to triumph, until in three centuries she had conquered the world. But when the first watch was over and the long dark ages marked the second and the third, how few were found faithful!

2. So, too, in the *individual life*; when a man begins the Christian race he does so with an ardour and enthusiasm which conquers every temptation and surmounts every trial; but this enthusiasm usually lasts only for a time.

Peter's fall is a striking illustration of the truth of this law. 'Master, though all shall be offended in thee, yet will not I,' he confidently affirmed at the beginning of that long night of our Lord's trial! And at first our Lord's prophecy of his ultimate failure seemed far enough off from fulfilment. See that flashing sword in the garden of betrayal! Others may fly, but Peter stands firm. Yes; in the first watch Simon is faithful. But see, how the long hours wear out the keenness of that braggart steel. See him as he follows so far off. See him as he stands among the servants in the High Priest's hall, so weak and timorous in his testimony that no one knows what he is. The second watch is already telling upon his faith and oozing the courage out of his soul. But now the third watch is passing by. Soon his trial will be over. Soon the dawn will be breaking upon the hills, telling that the long night of temptation is past. Soon the 'trumpeter of morn' will be sounding his shrill clarion of the dawn—yes, but not until Simon has fallen miserably before the Tempter's power. 'And if he come in the second watch, or if he come in the third watch, and find them so, blessed are those servants'; but if He come and find them swearing and saying, 'I know not the Man,' ah then the fourth watch will sound only on a sleeping soul!

There is a striking picture which represents Napoleon surprising a sleeping sentry. He has gone round his camp by night on the eve perhaps of a great battle and has come on this man prone upon the ground in profound unconsciousness. Instead of wakening him up, he just takes his musket which he has left lying on the ground and mounts guard himself, looking down from time to time on the faithless soldier. During one of these looks the soldier suddenly awakes, and you can see the agony in his face as he starts up to find his great commander looking down upon him. So the Lord looked on Peter in the hour of his betrayal, and so He looks on many still.

3. But the principle underlying our text may be broadened from individual instances to the *whole of life*. Life may be likened to a night of four

---

[1] L. J. Baggott, *Religion of the New Era*, 13.

watches. There is first the watch of childhood, then that of youth, then that of manhood and mid-life, and last of all that of life's declining years. Now of these four watches of life the principle of our text is also true. The most dangerous are its middle watches.

In his fine essay on Burns, Carlyle has spoken memorable words about the dangers of life's second watch. 'There are some,' he says, 'who declare vice to be the natural preparative for manhood, a kind of mud-bath, in which a youth must steep himself before the toga of manhood can be laid upon him. It is not so. We become men, not after we have been dissipated and disappointed in the chase after false pleasures, but after we have ascertained what impassable barriers hem us in through life how mad it is to hope for contentment to our infinite soul from the gifts of this extremely finite world; that a man must be sufficient in himself and that for suffering and sorrowing there is no remedy but striving and doing.'

Yes, manhood begins in the power to say 'No!' Watcher of the second watch, be vigilant! Be faithful, and then you will have gained half of life's battle and won half of life's crown. Half? Yes; but not the whole; for note the words which follow, 'and if he come in the *third* watch.' We hear a great deal about the dangers of youth and but little of those of middle life. Yet if we were to count life's shipwrecks we would find as many in the shoals of the thirties and the forties as on the rocks of the teens and the twenties.

What are the dangers of the third watch? They may be described as a general drowsiness of soul, a waning of the moral enthusiasms of youth, a coarsening and materializing of the idealisms of opening life, and above all an ebb-tide of faith. The moral and spiritual springs of life run low.

A professor of psychology, illustrating the power of somnambulism, told of a man who rose in his sleep from his bed and went down the stair to the door of his cottage and still he slept. He opened the door and stepped out into the street of the village where he dwelt, and still he slept. He passed out into the silent country, and still he slept. Not until his naked feet touched the cold waters of a stream that trickled across the road did he waken to the darkness of the night and the strange unfamiliar scene.

So in our churches there are men who sleep on through the strangest and most awakening experiences. The preacher tries to waken them with the message, 'Awake thou that sleepest, and arise from the dead, and Christ shall give thee light.' But still they sleep. God rings His warning bell by many an experience of joy or sorrow in their life, but still they sleep. Not until their feet reach the cold river of death will they waken to the darkness of a life that is lost, and the morning of a Judgment Day.

One of the great lessons which the Advent season would teach us is that Christ is coming. It was a lesson that was deeply impressed on the Early Church. It has grown too dim in ours.

That coming may take place at the end of the world, but whenever it be it will take place. Christ will come to us, if we are found faithful, and say, 'Well done, good and faithful servant, enter thou into the joy of thy lord.' How great the blessedness of such a faithful servant! Christ Himself has described it: 'Verily I say unto you, he shall gird himself, and make them to sit down to meat, and come forth and serve them.' What these wonderful words mean in all their fulness we do not pretend to understand. They have no doubt an immediate reference to Christ's first Communion when the Master girded Himself with a towel and washed the disciples' feet ere He sat down with the Twelve to supper; but their real reference is to the greater and grander Communion with His people above, when Christ shall welcome not the Twelve only, but 'ten thousand times ten thousand' to the joy and the peace of His eternal fellowship.

Meanwhile let us be watchful, watchful at all times, but specially in life's middle watches. And if it is difficult to be vigilant at such hours, let us remember this, that Christ is watching us as well; not with malevolent eye as Napoleon scanned the sleeping soldier, but with love and sympathy, and that He will come to those who seek His aid when the night is darkest and the need is sorest.

So Christ ever comes to those who look for Him in their hour of trial. Only one thing is needed, that while we watch we should also pray, pray that ours may be the strength to endure to the end.[1]

SECOND SUNDAY IN ADVENT.

Childlikeness.

'A little child shall lead them.'—Is 11^6.

It was one of Christ's most daring and beautiful statements that the citizen of His Kingdom must have the heart of a little child. With advancing years he must indeed put away childish things, but for all that he must retain his childlikeness. He need not be learned, great, or gifted, though God be thanked if these privileges be his, but he must be childlike. Our Lord stood firm upon this as the prime condition of discipleship.

---

[1] W. M. Mackay, *Days of the Son of Man*, 15.

What, then, are some of the qualities in the child's nature that we should emulate as Christians?

1. First of all there is *Sincerity*. One of the crying needs of our day in our business, in our politics, in our social intercourse, and in our religious life is for a deeper measure of sincerity. It is so easy to become like that character in the *Pilgrim's Progress*, Mr. Facing-both-ways. One might even think that in some regions of society transparency were the unpardonable sin. And yet how good it is to come across the character which is transparent, honest, genuine, guileless, sincere.

The word sincere comes from the Latin words *sine cera*. When Rome was mistress of the world and her grandees lived in marble palaces upon the banks of the Tiber, scuplture was one of the most prominent features of their costly furniture. Rome was stocked with works of Grecian art. Sometimes in the marble there were original flaws, or flaws caused by the chisel. These were filled by crafty workmen with a skilfully prepared composition of cement. At first it was imperceptible, but after a time the flaw became apparent. So frequently was the trick played that we find a clause often inserted in contracts of those times for the purchase of marble statuary to the effect that they must be *sine cera*. Perhaps these Latin words will come to mind as we sign ourselves 'yours sincerely,' and we must remember, too, that what we sign ourselves to one another we ought at least to be able to sign ourselves to God. We ought to be God's, sincerely, unreservedly, genuinely, with every flaw confessed, with every defect exposed. Hypocrisy—unreality—was the sin of sins in Christ's eyes, because more than anything else He saw that it cut at the roots of character. We have much need to pray in those beautiful words of *A Litany of Remembrance*, composed by the late Bishop of Southwell, 'From affectation and untruth, conscious or unconscious, from pretence and acting a part which is hypocrisy, from impulsive self-adaptation to the moment in unreality to please persons or make circumstances easy, strengthen us to manly simplicity to be, and be seen to be, true; and from all false appearances save us and help us, we humbly beseech thee, O Lord.'

2. *Simplicity* is another of the child qualities that we should emulate. The rush and luxury of modern life tend to deprave the taste, to make us blasé, and to kill the child-spirit within us. And yet to be truly Godlike we must be simple as children. The really great men have always been children in simplicity. So Tennyson describes the Duke of Wellington:

> Foremost captain of his time,
> Rich in saving common-sense,
> And, as the greatest only are,
> In his simplicity sublime.

St. Paul talks of the simplicity that is in Christ Jesus. It does us good to dwell on that Divine simplicity. Think, for instance, of Christ's mode of life. It puts our artificial life to shame. He was supremely content with the simple life. We can see, too, from the Gospels how He felt drawn rather to the peasant than the Pharisee, to the little child rather than the Scribe. The fact was that His very simplicity obscured His Divinity. Or, think again of His teaching, how simple it was! No wonder the common people heard Him gladly. What He taught was often hidden from the wise and prudent, but apparent unto babes. We gain the same effect of simplicity as we put the rites which Christ ordained alongside the gorgeous ritual of the Jewish Temple. How simple are the rites of Baptism and the Holy Communion. Once more, think of the simplicity of the gospel message that Christ has left to us under the guidance of His Spirit. As Glover says in that interesting book of his, *The Conflict of Religions in the Early Roman Empire*: 'that Christianity retained its character in the face of the most desperate efforts of its friends to turn it into a philosophy congenial to the philosophies of the day, was the result of the strong hold it had taken upon innumerable simple people, who had found in it the power of God in the transformation of their own characters and instincts, and who clung to Jesus Christ—to the great objective facts of His incarnation and death upon the Cross—as the firm foundations laid in the rock against which the floods of theory might beat in vain.'

3. Again, one of the most fascinating features of the young mind is its *open-mindedness*, its receptivity, its readiness to listen and to learn. Would that it were so with all of us. John Stuart Mill once remarked, 'The fatal tendency of mankind to leave off thinking about a thing, when to them it is no longer doubtful, is the cause of half their errors.' We must continually allow a fresh stream of thought to play about our most cherished opinions and beliefs if we desire that they should grow up strong and healthy. When a photographer is developing a plate, he keeps the liquid in constant motion over its surface and so gradually evolves

its hidden beauty into clearer outline. And so, too, each of us must keep a constant stream of vigorous thought and criticism playing upon the surface of our most cherished convictions if we would have their latent beauty revealed. Huxley well expressed the importance of the receptive mind in a letter quoted in Charles Kingsley's life: 'Science seems to me to teach in the highest and strongest manner the great truth which is embodied in the Christian conception of entire surrender to the will of God. Sit down before the fact as a little child, be prepared to give up every preconceived notion, follow humbly wherever and to whatever end Nature leads, or you shall learn nothing. . . . I have only begun to learn content and peace of mind since I have resolved at all risks to do this.'

4. But lastly, *the little child should lead us into the true meaning of Faith.* What an exquisite purity there is about the faith of children! Sometimes their confidence in us almost makes us ashamed of ourselves. Father stands at the bottom of the stairs and calls out to his little boy to jump, and from five or six feet up the little fellow jumps with perfect confidence into the strong arms of his parent. And yet our Heavenly Father bids us venture this and risk that for the love of Him, and how often we are afraid of jumping. But we shall never do very much for God until we can trust Him with that same uncalculating faith with which a child confides in his parents.

This is the cry of the human soul in its helplessness. 'Father, clothe me, feed me, supply my many wants, for I have no strength of myself to help myself.' And as surely as we delight to provide for our helpless children and to feel that they look absolutely to us for strength and support, so does God delight to hear our cry of faith and to feel that we are looking to Him to clothe us with His righteousness, to feed us with His own truth, and to teach us to walk with Him, and talk to Him. Such is faith, the child's spirit of dependence, that is what it is in essence, though it needs and gains as life goes on the additional strength that comes from reason and experience.[1]

THIRD SUNDAY IN ADVENT.

Christ's Quest and Ours.

'Nevertheless when the Son of man cometh, shall he find faith on the earth?'—Lk 18^8.

Faith occupies, in the Christian religion, not only a conspicuous but a commanding place. The great inheritance that has come down to us is largely a history of faith: its trials, its patience, its eclipses, its victories.

It is not strange to find Christ insisting on the supreme value of faith; but the manner of His doing so in this passage is peculiarly arresting. He virtually tells us that this is now to be His great Adventure—the Quest for faith. He fixes His eye on some supreme crisis of the world's history, the day of His own coming, whatever that may mean, and the first, indeed the only question, that springs to His lips is this, Shall He find faith—faith on the earth? Shall He find the soul of the world keeping its tryst with Him? That is the point of the inquiry, Shall He find faith as a normal condition?

There is an even more disturbing and alarming note in the inquiry. Indeed, we must give the question its acutest point. Did He foresee a terrible decline in faith?

Now if this inquiry meant so much to Him, if this be His Quest, what does it mean to us? This challenging question flung with deliberate hand into the face of history, is plainly meant to arouse our conscience and to drive us forth upon an endless but not fruitless quest for faith.

Let us try to make clear to ourselves, therefore, what this Quest of ours must be. It is clear that the end, the supreme end, we must set before ourselves is the discovery of a faith that will endure. It is a persistent faith we must seek. No one but Christ would dare to use the Parable of the Unjust Judge as an example of *persistent faith*, and even from His lips it may seem a hard saying that a victorious faith must be prepared to persist in the face of what appears to be coldness and indifference to the interests of justice itself. But if the heavens give no answer, and the mills of God go on, if the shattering power seems all on the side of evil and only our cry on the other side, how long can we persist?

The importunate, the persistent faith must be a living faith, it must be a *faith in a very present God.* Maurice once said with something of a caustic tone about Carlyle that he believed in a God who lived until the death of Oliver Cromwell. The gibe was not quite fair to Carlyle, but emphatically that kind of faith will not do. An expositor has very shrewdly remarked of the woman at the well of Samaria, that in two phrases, 'Our fathers worshipped in this mountain,' and 'When Messias cometh,' she betrayed the fact that religion as a vital force was dead in her, and remained only as a dim memory or a distant hope. That will not suffice. We shall soon lose the energy of faith, unless we believe God to be present in the life of every day.

---

[1] Malcolm Archibald, *A Memoir*, 156.

But we must go a step further—a living *faith can only be maintained by activity*, by exercise. The proverb which says that a man who does not work becomes an astrologer, a star-gazer, is applicable to faith—without exercise it will soon turn to credulity. 'That we have little faith is not sad, but that we have but little faithfulness. By faithfulness faith is earned. When in the progress of life a man swerves though only by an angle infinitely small from his proper and allotted path, then the drama of his life turns to tragedy, and makes haste to its fifth act.' Faith is maintained as much by works as works are by faith. The work of self-discipline, of brotherly kindness, of Christian testimony, the simple homely pieties of life—without these faith will die—it must perish from the earth.

And to sum up, faith must be constantly verifying itself, adding new realms to the area of the ascertained, the secure, the irrevocably certain. Faith must be no courtesy title for absence of thought and aversion to thinking.

If our faith cannot stand squarely before science, philosophy, history without fear or apology, then, indeed, is there reason in our day to hear again the question, 'When the Son of man cometh, shall he find faith on the earth?'

But how can we secure a faith like this? The faith that will persist in our time must be moulded by the creative spirit of Jesus, which began Christianity in the first century, and has kept it in being ever since. He Himself lived so calmly in the peace of God, questioning none of God's ways, trusting to His wise will from day to day, and He crowned this life with a sacrifice so final, so stupendous, that He became for His disciples, as He must be for every age, the best, the only, guarantee that He shall find faith on the earth when He comes. He is Himself the answer to His own question.

From kingdom to kingdom we may see, if we care, the testimonies crowding on us that when the Son of Man cometh He shall find faith on the earth. But will He find it in us?[1]

---

[1] A. Connell, *The Endless Quest*, 3.

Books that have influenced our Epoch.

W. Robertson Smith's 'The Religion of the Semites.'

By the Reverend William M. Mathieson, B.D., Broughty Ferry.

William Robertson Smith's preface to the first edition of *The Religion of the Semites* is dated 1st October 1889. The book has thus attained its fortieth anniversary; and the years which have elapsed since its publication may be described as quite distinctively 'our epoch' in respect of Old Testament studies and the science of Comparative Religion, to mention only the two fields of knowledge which concern us in the present connexion. One of the customary descriptions of *The Religion of the Semites* is 'epoch-making.' If the book on its appearance helped to make an epoch in its own domain of investigation, its author had already for nearly twenty years been helping to inaugurate that epoch by a series of writings which mediated to English readers the results of a strictly scientific study of Holy Scripture. From his article 'Angel' in vol. ii. of the *Encyclopædia Britannica* (1875) to his article 'Zephaniah' in vol. xxiv. (1888) he had covered a wide range of Biblical and allied topics. It was in 1881 that Robertson Smith, on his deposition from the Old Testament Chair in the Free Church College at Aberdeen, was appointed joint-editor of the *Encyclopædia Britannica*. In the eleven volumes issued before then there were some twenty articles written by him; in the succeeding thirteen volumes there were more than two hundred. From his inaugural lecture ('What History teaches us to seek in the Bible') at Aberdeen College in 1870 on through his various pleadings in the long-drawn-out heresy cases which lasted from 1876 till 1881, Robertson Smith had been the channel through which there had come to many of his contemporaries ideas and points of view which were novel. His lectures on *The Old Testament in the Jewish Church* (published in 1881; 2nd edition, 1892), and on *The Prophets of Israel* (published in 1882; 2nd edition, with Introduction and Additional

Notes by T. K. Cheyne, 1902), continued this work, making abundantly clear their author's scholarly equipment and power of lucid exposition. The significance of his work in this connexion may be seen indirectly in the fact that the same year which saw the publication of *The Religion of the Semites* saw also the dedication to Robertson Smith of Wellhausen's *Composition des Hexateuchs* in its completed and amplified form. In the following year came another noteworthy dedication to him, namely, that of the first edition of J. G. Frazer's *The Golden Bough.* These two dedications in successive years are a clear indication of the significance which scholars had come to attach to his work alike in the regions of Biblical science and of anthropology. In the latter connexion Salomon Reinach's words may be quoted: 'Smith, in his too short life, did more than the magnificent work to which his name is attached, more still than his illuminative teaching and lecturing in Scotland and in England. *Genuit Frazerum!*' (*Quarterly Review*, October 1911). In *The Religion of the Semites* Robertson Smith was certainly a 'begetter' of much that has come to birth in these last forty years; and sober, competent judges do not hesitate to describe him as the founder of the present-day Science of Religion.

The book in which this foundation and formative work was presented to the world is the subject of the present article. Robertson Smith himself, in the closing months of his life, practically completed the preparation of the second edition, which was put into its final form and seen through the press by his close friend and subsequent biographer, Dr. J. Sutherland Black.[1] Thus revised, the second edition appeared about six months after Robertson Smith's death (1894). A German translation, with certain modifications and additions, was published in 1899 (R. Stübe, *Die Religion der Semiten*, with preface by E. Kautzsch). English readers are now in possession of a third edition, edited by Dr. S. A. Cook of Cambridge (1927). Dr. Cook, in a spirit of scholarly *pietas*, has expended a great deal of labour and specialized knowledge in the preparation of this edition. He has brought up to date the references to relevant literature; he has added a large body of notes and prepared a new bibliography; and he has written a long introduction. In its latest form the book is a valuable work of reference, and indicates fully the new developments to which Robertson Smith's pioneering work of forty years ago has led up. Amid all additions and amplifications Robertson Smith's own writing (left unaltered as it appeared in the second edition), stands out vigorous, clear, and stimulating, justifying both by subject-matter and by style the place which the book still holds in the references and bibliographies attached to works which deal in any adequate way with things Biblical, Semitic, and anthropological.

Perhaps our treatment of *The Religion of the Semites* may be most usefully divided into two sections, one dealing with the book's origins and characteristics, the other with its contents and the general trend of its argument.

I.

Origins and Characteristics.

It is not a far-fetched proceeding to trace the peculiar qualities and the lasting merits of *The Religion of the Semites* to the very nature of the author's mind. His student days at Aberdeen University showed him to possess quite remarkable powers of mental acquisition and tenacity. To the very end all his work was characterized by accurate and detailed knowledge. The book we are considering is based on a large body of facts collected from the whole field of Semitic knowledge as that was open to investigation in Robertson Smith's day. His argument enlists the aid of an extraordinary number of recondite references to Arabic, Greek, and other writers, with the relevant information from whom Robertson Smith had patiently and laboriously made himself acquainted at first hand. He viewed and reviewed this whole field of facts and references in a thoroughly scientific spirit. Here we touch another characteristic of his intellect, namely, its scientific temper and precision. He would have been a distinguished mathematician and natural philosopher if he had not elected to give himself to Semitic studies. He gained the Ferguson Mathematical Scholarship, the highest distinction open to a Scottish University student of his standing; and during the latter part of his theological course at New College, Edinburgh, he acted with great distinction as assistant to Professor P. G. Tait of the Chair of Natural Philosophy at Edinburgh University. He brought his scientific outlook to bear upon all his religious studies. It was to him an eminently reasonable proceeding that the facts of Biblical and other religions should be sifted and estimated, not under the constraint of theological ideas and ecclesiastical dogma, but in the free spirit of scientific inquiry. To the end of his life Robertson Smith believed that there was a fundamental difference between the religion of the Israelites as we find it in the Old Testament and the religions of other nations. However wide and deep his studies went, they never overthrew this conviction. But he held that the facts of the Biblical revelation should be frankly and carefully compared with the facts and phenomena of other faiths. The thoroughness and reverence with which he himself did this is one of the basic virtues of *The Religion of the Semites.*

---

[1] *The Life of William Robertson Smith*, by John Sutherland Black and George Chrystal, 1912. The same collaborators edited a companion volume, *Lectures and Essays of William Robertson Smith*, published along with the foregoing.

Along with knowledge and a scientific temper of mind there went two other qualities which helped to give the book its special excellence and importance: these were insight and independence of judgment. Robertson Smith's mind had a certain penetrating power, and that the penetration of sympathy with quite remote and alien points of view, as well as with the essential doctrines of the Christian faith. Dr. S. A. Cook's words are worth quoting in this connexion (*The Religion of the Semites*, 3rd edition, Introduction, p. xlvii): 'If *The Religion of the Semites* marks an epoch, it was because it came from the hands of a man who combined with unequalled knowledge a sympathetic insight into the most advanced and the most rudimentary religions in a way which has not been equalled by his successors, and whose genius saw new prospects opening out in the world of thought. With him: *la théorie c'est l'homme.*' The theory was the man likewise in respect of the originality of the main ideas which Robertson Smith employed to correlate and interpret the great mass of facts which he was surveying. As a student he had impressed his Old Testament teacher, A. B. Davidson, with his independence and originality of mind in dealing with the topics presented for class exercises. When, just at the end of his New College course, Robertson Smith became a candidate for the vacant Old Testament Chair in the Aberdeen Free Church College, A. B. Davidson testified that he was 'by far the most distinguished student I have ever had in my department. By this I mean not only that his acquirements are greater, but that they are of a different kind. Mr. Smith not only knows Hebrew well, but he knows well that which constitutes Hebrew, or any other of that class of languages. He knows more perfectly than any young man I ever came across the principles both of the Grammar and of the Idiom of the Semitic languages.' Then, towards the end of his encomium, we find the professor adding that 'what is surprising in so young a man is the maturity as well as the striking independence of his mind.'[1] This independence of Robertson Smith's thinking, not wilful or fantastic, but accompanied by mature knowledge and speculation, made him a pioneer in Semitic studies and not merely a mediator of other men's results. It was through A. B. Davidson that the results of the latest Old Testament scholarship first reached him; and the future author of *The Religion of the Semites* was thus fortunate in his earliest contact with Hebrew studies. A. B. Davidson by his cautious yet scientific presentation of critical positions did a great service as teacher and writer. But his pupil by 'the striking independence of his mind' exercised a more original and formative influence than the master. Davidson's caution seemed sometimes to verge on timidity. In his later work he did not maintain the élan and boldness of his early fragment, *A Commentary Critical and Exegetical on the Book of Job* (1862), a work which is rightly considered to be the first really scientific commentary on the Old Testament in the English language. Robertson Smith was set upon the true and fruitful path of progress in Old Testament studies by his professor; but his boldness and originality brought it about that he played a more distinctively pioneering rôle than the older man.

Such were the characteristics of Robertson Smith's mind and scholarship when he became Old Testament Professor in the Free Church College at Aberdeen, as a young man of twenty-four, in 1870. Shortly before this appointment he had formed in Edinburgh a friendship with Mr. J. F. M'Lennan, whose interests in the region of primitive life and customs soon created an enduring bond between them. M'Lennan's studies in the subject of totemism roused the interest of his young friend; and soon after Robertson Smith's removal to Aberdeen we find the two in correspondence on this and other topics connected with comparative religion. Thus from the very commencement of his professorial life Robertson Smith had ideas about totemism in his mind which soon discovered points of contact with his own particular subjects of study and gave birth to one of the main lines of argument in the work whose origins we are tracing. The nineteen years which elapsed between his settlement in Aberdeen and the publication of *The Religion of the Semites* show us the qualities we have indicated above at work on the material of Semitic studies, in a way which makes that book a

[1] *Life of William Robertson Smith*, p. 119.

natural culmination of his labours and interests up till the time of its appearance. Besides his Old Testament work there were his Arabic studies, on which we find him well launched during a summer semester (1872) under Paul de Lagarde at Göttingen. Here he began his reading in Arabic poetry which, together with the work of the Arab historians, provided much material for his subsequent investigations into Semitic religion. These Arabic studies were prosecuted with special vigour during his Eastern tours of the winter and spring of 1878–79 and of 1879–80. These travels and sojourns in Egypt, Palestine, Syria, and Arabia were made possible by his suspension from the duties of his Aberdeen Chair while the Free Church was trying to come to some definite finding on the teaching of its brilliant but disconcerting young teacher. '*Nuper in Arabia exul felix commoratus* . . .' said the Public Orator (J. E. Sandys) of him later at Cambridge. This sojourn in Arabia was certainly a fortunate exile from the point of view of Robertson Smith's work as teacher of Arabic and expounder of things Semitic. It confirmed him in some of the ideas about primitive Semitic religion and social organization already in his mind, and it contributed to that feeling of contact with reality which his Cambridge pupils experienced in his instruction, and which helps to make *The Religion of the Semites* a living book, despite the somewhat recondite nature of its various trains of argument. Between the two Eastern tours alluded to above, Robertson Smith had completed his paper on 'Animal Worship and Animal Tribes among the Arabs and in the Old Testament,' which appeared in the *Journal of Philology* in June 1880, and is a landmark on the way towards the production of his greatest work.

His removal to Cambridge on his appointment as Lord Almoner's Reader in Arabic (1883) brought him fully into the work of Arabic studies; and the public lectures which he delivered in successive years as holder of this appointment all were on topics which revealed the line of his speculations: *The Early Relations of Arabia with Syria, and particularly with Palestine; The History of Palmyra; Kinship and Marriage in Early Arabia; The Theory of Sacrifice, illustrated by a Comparison of Semitic and Greek Ritual.* It was in April 1887 that the invitation came to him from the Burnett Trustees to deliver a series of lectures at Aberdeen on Semitic Religions. Robertson Smith gladly accepted; and it was arranged that the lectures should deal with 'the primitive religions of the Semitic peoples viewed in relation to other ancient religions and to the spiritual religion of the Old Testament and of Christianity.' His plan was to deliver three series. The first series, consisting of eight lectures, was given in the hall of Marischal College, Aberdeen, in October 1888 and March 1889. With the addition of other three lectures and certain 'Dissertations,' they were published in November 1889, under the title *Lectures on the Religion of the Semites. First Series: The Fundamental Institutions.* In that same year Robertson Smith was appointed to succeed Professor William Wright in the Sir Thomas Adam's Chair of Arabic at Cambridge. While discharging the duties of this appointment he continued, under the burden of ill-health and increasing physical disability, to accumulate corroborative evidence of the main theses of his book, and to consider the views which it had called forth from other scholars, though these were less helpful than he had hoped. The results of this further study were embodied in the second edition of the book. This appeared, as we have seen, some months after his death, which occurred in March 1894.

Such were the origins remote and immediate—origins in Smith's personal gifts and in the course of his studies—which produced the book we are considering, and stamped its individuality upon it. To set the book thus against the background of Smith's bold and vigorous intellect, and of the development of his special interests, is to be enabled to realize how it became a work truly personal and expressive of its author's mind, and so a living contribution to knowledge, whose value does not depend on the validity of its special theories, but on the impulse it has given to all subsequent speculation in the region with which it deals.

II.

CONTENTS.

The material contained in *The Religion of the Semites* is distributed over eleven lectures. To the retaining of the lecture form we may probably attribute a certain amount of repetition, a certain diffuseness and lack of close articulation in the development of the main positions which the writer seeks to establish. A condensed and re-arranged version would give a clearer impression of the trend of the argumentation. But as the work stands, it conveys a sense of life and of living, if gradual, progression from point to point. We shall, therefore, instead of selecting one or two leading topics and lifting them out of their context, try to present the various lines of thought as these emerge from lecture to lecture in the course of the author's treatment.

He begins in Lecture I. with a survey of the distribution of the Semitic peoples and of their interrelations, their linguistic unity, and the fact that they form a homogeneous group. Where shall we look for evidence as to the earliest forms of their religion? Not to the complex civilizations of Babylonia and Assyria, but rather to the primitive nomads, represented by the tribes of Arabia. The material for investigation in this direction is scanty; but a good deal of evidence may be gleaned from the study of pre-Islamic heathenism in Arabia. The best evidence for this primitive religion will be found in details of ritual. One of Robertson Smith's chief points is the priority of cult and ceremony over myths as evidence for truly antique conceptions of religion. Like dogma, to which it is the ancient parallel, myth is secondary and derivative.

In the Lecture which follows, the writer goes on to discuss the nature of the religious community, pointing out the social character of primitive religion and laying stress upon the solidarity of the gods and their worshippers as forming one organic society. Communal and group conceptions in religion are fully illustrated, as this idea forms an essential part of the subsequent main positions which the author seeks to establish. An actual physical affinity, a true blood kinship between the gods and their worshippers is argued for, and illustrated, as determinative of the socio-religious practices of the primitive Semites. Out of this came the later ideas of the deity's fatherhood or motherhood or monarchial relation to the worshipping community.

At this point the writer feels it necessary (Lecture III.) to indicate how the intercourse between gods and men is regulated by the relations which the gods are conceived to bear to the world of Nature, that is, to the physical environment in which man is placed. This discussion of the local relations of the gods gives rise to a consideration of the region within which a god's authority may be recognized by his worshippers, and of the sanctuaries where they expect to enter into communication with him. Semitic conceptions of gods as Baalim, and of the relation of the Baal to his land, are reviewed, and also ideas as to the functions of the Baalim and the nature of the worship offered to them at their holy places. There follows a discussion of the nature of the Arab *jinn*, and of the triumph of the 'friendly' gods over the *jinn*. This leads to the subject of totemism,[1] the origin of local gods and the origin of totemism being kindred problems. 'The belief in local nature-gods that are also clan-gods may not be directly evolved out of an earlier totemism, but there can be no reasonable doubt that it is evolved out of ideas or usages which also find their expression in totemism, and therefore must go back to the most primitive stage of savage society.' Among the non-human or superhuman animate kinds, or even inorganic kinds, the totem animal or object was the kin of each member of the totem group and therefore the friend of the group; and in this way the friendly local Baals represent, or correspond to, the more primitive totems. It should be noted that Robertson Smith adds this proviso: 'But we are not to suppose that every local deity will have totem associations, for new gods as well as new sanctuaries might doubtless spring up at a later stage of human progress than that of which totemism is characteristic.'

The argument now goes on to consider how man comes into relationship with his god or gods through certain places and things, and leads to a consideration of how such places are related to man. Wherein consists the 'holiness' of these places (or seasons, or persons, or things), and how must man comport himself in view of this 'holiness'? Lecture IV., which contains this discussion, is one of the shortest but one of the most fascinating in the book. In the opinion of the present writer the views of 'holiness' and of 'uncleanness' set forth in this Lecture (and in notes B and C which go with it) are the most brilliantly and convincingly argued of all the positions which the author seeks to establish. Robertson Smith's argument here casts more light on the earliest stages of Old Testament religion, and explains more satisfactorily some of the most primitive conceptions still to be traced in that religion, than his more celebrated expositions connected with totemism and the communion theory of sacrifice. As he linked savage totemism with Semitic Baal-worship, so he uses the idea of taboo among primitive peoples to illustrate the, at first sight, contrasted conceptions of holiness and uncleanness. He shows that in the earliest stages of religion these ideas are akin, and are connected with purely physical and materialistic conceptions.

---

[1] Totemism may be described in a general way as the cult of a social group, especially an exogamous one, which stands to a species of animal or plant (generally edible), or to an object or class of objects, in an intimate relationship; the totem is treated as a cognate to be respected, and not to be eaten or used, or at least only under certain restrictions.

Each is connected with the idea of a possible 'infection' through contact with places or things in which supernatural powers or influences reside. The holy and the unclean alike must be kept from ordinary use; and contact with either involves supernatural danger and demands a process of cleansing. A relic of this way of thinking and of the original connexion between the ideas of holiness and uncleanness may be seen in the Rabbinical description of canonical scriptures (those acknowledged to be '*holy* scripture,' in our phrase) as books that '*defile* the hands.' As regards various regulations anent ceremonial uncleanness which we find in the later parts of the Old Testament, Robertson Smith puts the matter thus: 'The irrationality of laws of uncleanness, from the standpoint of spiritual religion or even of the higher heathenism, is so manifest, that they must necessarily be looked on as having survived from an earlier form of faith and of society. And this being so, I do not see how any historical student can refuse to class them with savage taboos.'

Next comes an interesting presentation (Lecture V.) of the facts connected with some of the adjuncts and objects which are to be found at, or which constitute, holy places. A wide range of information about natural and artificial sanctuaries is drawn upon to illustrate the way in which, and the ideas with which, the worshipper approaches his god. There is a full and illuminating discussion of holy waters and wells; sacred trees and poles, caves and pits; holy stones, pillars, and altars. The primitive sacred stone or cairn, conceived as a dwelling-place of the deity or as the symbol of the deity's presence, and daubed with ritual blood to establish or re-establish contact with the deity, is shown as evolving into, but not wholly displaced by, the later altar, whether conceived as a hearth for burnt sacrifices or as a table of offerings.

Thus the way is prepared for the theme of sacrifice which occupies the remainder of the book (Lectures VI.–XI.). It is viewed as the central and most significant act of primitive religion; and the questions arising out of it are discussed in the light both of Semitic and other evidence. 'Why sacrifice is the typical form of all complete acts of worship in the antique religions, and what the sacrificial act means, is an involved and difficult problem. The problem does not belong to any one religion, for sacrifice is equally important among all early peoples in all parts of the world where religious ritual has reached any considerable development. Here, therefore, we have to deal with an institution that must have been shaped by the action of general causes, operating very widely and under conditions that were common in primitive times to all races of mankind.'

While thus preserving a world-wide view, we enter upon a discussion of the various kinds and materials of Semitic sacrifice, leading up to the concentration of attention upon such animal sacrifices as are shared between the worshipper and the god—the blood being poured out at the sacred stone or altar, certain parts of the carcase being given over to the god, while the remainder serves as the wherewithal for a sacred feast by the worshippers. Of this character is the Hebrew *zébaḥ*; and Robertson Smith puts his theory of sacrifice in a nutshell when he says that the *zébaḥ* 'is not a mere attenuated offering, in which man grudges to give up the whole victim to his god. On the contrary, the central significance of the rite lies in the act of communion between God and man, where the worshipper is admitted to eat of the same holy flesh, of which a part is laid upon the altar as "the food of the deity."'

This point of view is based upon and explained by the totemic theory of the nature of primitive Semitic religion, with its idea of the unity or kinship of totem and totem folk. Such is the unity of the god and his worshippers; and the sacrificial victim was originally of totemic character, its blood (conceived as its life) being the actual physical bond between the deity and the sacrificing individuals, deity and worshippers comprising one stock, one group of natural kin. The smearing of the primitive stone with the victim's blood or the pouring out of the victim's blood at the altar was a strengthening or renewal of the bond between worshippers and god. The division of the carcase between god and worshippers was their joining in a common meal. This communion idea was the heart of the matter; and to deepen or restore the sense of communion with the deity was the aim of the earliest sacrificial worship. 'We can affirm that the idea of the sacrificial meal as an act of communion is older than sacrifice in the sense of tribute, and that the latter notion grew up with the development of agricultural life and the conception of the deity as Baal of the land. Among the nomadic Arabs the idea of sacrificial tribute has little or no place; . . . the object of the sacrifice is to provide the material for an act of sacrificial communion with the god.'

In this connexion we can do no more than refer to the use which Robertson Smith makes of the evidence of Nilus as to the habits of the Arabs of the Sinaitic desert towards the close of the fourth Christian century. There we see solemn clan slaughter of a camel for food in time of extreme need, and the regulations for the procedure on such occasions. This Robertson Smith makes the main definite link, though by no means the only indication of connexion, between totemism and Semitic sacrifice, the same conception of belonging to the one physical stock being presumed to exist in both cases, and the fact being noted that only under pressure of hunger or in connexion with exceptional religious rites is it lawful for savages to kill their totem. A part of his argument is summed up in the sentence: 'Now if kinship between the gods and their worshippers, on the one hand, and kinship between the gods and certain kinds of animals, on the other, are deep-seated principles of Semitic religion, manifesting themselves in all parts of the sacred institutions of the race, we must necessarily conclude that kinship between families of men and animal kinds was an idea equally deep-seated, and we shall expect to find that sacred animals, wherever they occur, will be treated with the regard which men pay to their kinsfolk.' Sacrificial animals, then, were originally such as men considered to be akin to themselves and to their god; they were of a holy kind whose lives, like those of all domestic animals originally, were protected by religious scruples and sanctions. They were united with their 'possessors' (a term which would in the primitive conception be unsuitable) in a bond of blood kinship; and even in much less primitive times the slaughter of any such animal was a sacrificial act.

From the primitive conception of communion sacrifice other aspects of sacrifice and other types of sacrificial ritual are derived. For example, by virtue of the fact that the aim in sacrifice is to confirm or revive the bond of unity between the worshippers and their god, healing any breach of fellowship which may have been felt to exist, the sacrificial ritual comes to be conceived as having atoning significance. The ritual puts worshippers and god 'at one' again. The idea of sacrificial communion thus holds the germ of piacular conceptions and rites. 'In all the older forms of Semitic ritual the notions of communion and atonement are bound up together, atonement being simply an act of communion designed to wipe out all memory of previous estrangement.' The atoning virtue of the rite, in its earliest piacular intention, is to be dissociated from the death of the victim and from every idea of penal satisfaction to the deity. How later developments in sacrificial ceremonial and procedure—*e.g.* whole burnt offerings, and other forms of oblation—have obscured the original communion aim is dealt with; and an interesting position is elaborated as to the influence of the growth of ideas of private property upon the later motives to sacrifice, *e.g.* a gift or tribute conception. This leads to the arresting statement: 'On the whole, then, the introduction of ideas of property into the relations between men and their gods seems to have been one of the most fatal aberrations in the development of ancient religion.'

These are the most characteristic points in the lectures on sacrifice, though many other topics connected with the nature, meaning, and evolution of the various kinds of sacrificial rite are discussed with fullness of knowledge and keenness of insight.

From the foregoing it is evident that *The Religion of the Semites* does not cover anything like the whole field of Semitic religion; nor does it profess to do so. Robertson Smith's health did not permit him to put into complete and written form the substance of the second and third series of Burnett Lectures as he had projected them and was shaping them in his mind. In March 1890 he delivered the second series—three lectures on (1) Feasts; (2) Priests and the Priestly Oracle; and (3) Prophecy and Divination—while in December 1891 he gave a third series of three lectures on the general subject of 'The nature and origin of the gods of Semitic Heathenism, their relations to one another, the myths that surround them, and the whole subject of religious belief, so far as is not directly involved in the observances of daily religious life.' Of these lectures only very rough notes and inadequate press reports survive. During the next two years Robertson Smith was planning a second volume of *The Religion of the Semites*, as well as revising the first volume. The late Principal T. M. Lindsay, who was a fellow-guest with him at a friend's house in August 1893, tells of his conversations with the invalid: 'He had no doubt, so far as those talks went, that he had not very long to live. Twice he told me that he wished that he had a few years more to live for two reasons: he desired to outlive his mother, whose grief at his death would be overwhelming, and he longed to spare her that sorrow; and he was very anxious to finish his Burnett Lectures. He recurred to those unfinished lectures several times, and always with one dominant idea . . . he longed to be able "to complete his argument."'

The intervening years have dealt in various ways with Robertson Smith's positions and arguments, confirming some, casting doubt on others. It would require a special article to discuss adequately the new materials available now for the study of Semitic religion, and the new light which has been shed on the subject both from the side of anthropological and psychological investigations, and from that of linguistic and archæological researches in the ancient history and civilization (how complex, we are only now realizing) of South-West Asia. These new materials and sources of information will yield fresh guidance in the region of Biblical and allied studies in so far as the investigator of to-day carries on his task with the same painstaking yet zestful zeal, with the same comprehensive outlook, with the same sympathy and reverence, with the same scientific methods, as enabled William Robertson Smith to inaugurate a new epoch by the labours of which some results are presented with illuminating and stimulating power in *The Religion of the Semites*.

A Note on the 'Second Coming.'

By the Reverend Canon Bindley, D.D., Denton, Norfolk.

I have often wondered whether the Christian Church has not been as much mistaken about what is called the 'Second Coming' of Christ as the Jewish Church was mistaken about the First Coming of its Messiah. The Jews looked for a Prince of the House of David, a Conqueror who would crush the Gentile oppressors, rule them with a rod of iron, and break them in pieces like a potter's vessel, One who should 'redeem Israel' and 'restore the kingdom.' And our Lord had to teach His disciples the real meaning of the Scripture prophecies which they were so 'slow of heart' to understand. They had looked for a kingdom of this world in this world, one that 'came with observation'; and they were taught that His Sovereignty, although to be established in this world, was not of this world; that it was to be established in the hearts of individuals, slowly permeating like the leaven, and unhurriedly spreading in growth like the mustard bush.

Their Messiah did come to the Jews, but in a guise very different from what they expected. A lowly Babe, in humble station, who yet grew up under the Spirit's indwelling into a Teacher of loftiest insight and sublimest ethical revelation of the nature and requirements of His heavenly Father who was the God not of Jews only, but of every race and of every individual human being and of all Nature.

The earliest generation of Christians seems to have misunderstood the 'Second Coming' of Christ in much the same way. They looked for a catastrophic event within their own lifetime, and the 'Coming' proved to be an agelong process, a continuous present Judgment, the constant Presence of Christ with His followers. Nothing could have been clearer than the words placed upon Christ's own lips by the writer of the Fourth Gospel. 'I will not leave you orphans: I come to you': that was His promise, paralleled in the First Gospel by 'I am with you all the days, even to the end of the world.' Here were definite assurances so plain that it seems hard to see how they could be misunderstood. By the time that the Fourth Gospel was written the expectation of the speedy earthly Return of Christ was seen to be a mistake. The eschatology of the Synoptists has been refined. Eternal life is shown to consist in the knowledge of God, which is quite independent of time and its changes, and is to be enjoyed here and now, not postponed to some future existence after death or at the end of this world. Jesus corrects Martha's notion of a resurrection at the last day by the proclamation that He *is* the Resurrection and the Life. In another context, His 'Going' to the Father is a 'Coming' to His disciples. He comes to be with them as 'Another Comforter.' His Spirit is as truly identified with Himself as He was identified with the Father. 'He that hath seen Me hath seen the Father.' 'I and the Father are one.' 'The Father will give you Another Comforter, the Spirit of Truth. . . . I come to you.' The true meaning of these expressions seems to have been hidden from the understanding of the early believers. They interpreted them in the light of their apocalyptic expectations that the glorious Coming would be a visible Advent of the Son of Man on the clouds of heaven, as depicted in the Books of Enoch, to inaugurate with catastrophic overthrow of all evil a reign of righteousness on this earth. Hence the millenarian views of the first two centuries. This was the atmosphere, the background of belief and expectation, in which nearly all the books of the New Testament were written. It is prominent in St. Paul's letters, in the epistles attributed to St.

Peter, and especially in the Apocalypse. The last book is indeed a typical setting forth of visions and hopes, coloured by Old Testament and other Jewish apocalypses—notably Enoch, Jubilees, and the Twelve Testaments—which times of persecution elicited. Millenarianism disappeared after the third century, but the language and beliefs of the Christian Church still clung to the fundamental error of Millenarianism; and consequently the notions of a Grand Assize, and a Last Day, and a simultaneous universal Judgment of quick and dead, have been characteristic of Christian creed and teaching ever since.

Now a careful examination of the general tenor of Christ's own words would have avoided this. Symbolical phrases have been interpreted as if they were literal statements. A process has been degraded into a catastrophic event. Present tenses have been translated as futures. The Latins misrepresented ἐρχόμενος (continuous present) by *venturus* (distant eventuality). What was intended to be inconceivably dread and awful has been rendered practically ineffective. That which is postponed to a very distant date is difficult to realize and almost intuitively disbelieved. True teaching would have insisted that the Christ is always present: that the Judgment is always being enacted: that the evil character or the evil action carries its own punishment within itself. There is no gap between the clauses in the Nicene Creed: 'He ascended into heaven: Cometh to judge.' They are synchronous.

If our Lord's words are sanely interpreted, with a due regard to their Oriental symbolism where symbolism is involved, and quite explicitly where no symbolism is used, a great many difficulties disappear from passages which promise the Coming of the Son of Man or of the Kingdom of Heaven within the lifetime of that existing generation. Mt 10[23] promises that the first missioners will not have gone through the cities of Israel till the Son of Man be come. Mk 9[1] (with its parallels Lk 9[27], Mt 16[28]) assures some of the bystanders that they will not taste of death till they see the Kingdom of God come with power. The writer of the First Gospel, *more suo*, amplifies the original of Mk 13 (Mt 24[29-34]) by introducing some fresh apocalyptical details. After the description of the terrors of the destruction of Jerusalem he adds: 'But immediately after the tribulation of those days, the sun shall be darkened, and the moon shall not give her light, and the stars shall fall from heaven, and the powers of the heavens shall be shaken; *and then shall appear the sign of the Son of Man in heaven; and then shall all the tribes of the earth mourn*, and they shall see the Son of Man coming on the clouds of heaven with power and great glory. And He shall send forth His messengers *with a great sound of a trumpet*, and they shall gather together His elect from the four winds, from one end of heaven to the other. . . . Verily I say unto you, this generation shall not pass away till all these things be accomplished.'

Interpreted in the light of apocalyptic symbolism, this language is seen to be descriptive of the passing of the Jewish Church and the birth of the new Christian era. The trumpet of God is the Gospel call beginning to sound throughout all nations, when the ἄγγελοι, the messengers of Christ, began their work of gathering together the elect from all quarters. That trumpet is still sounding, that work still going on, and the judgment, the distinction, the separation, proceeds all the time. The true meaning of Christ's 'Second Advent' is to be recovered, I believe, not by postponing it to some dim and distant day called 'The Day of Judgment,' or 'The End of the World,' but by realizing His constant Presence with us always, now, here, and wherever two or three are gathered together in His Name.

It is worth noting that the phrase 'The Day of the Lord' in its original popular sense denoted a victory of Israel's God over Israel's enemies. The prophets took up the popular term, but warned their hearers that unless they repented and changed their lives, *der Tag* would be one of black darkness and terror instead of brightness and joy (Am 5[18-20]). They used it as a symbol of the great judicial vindication of the godly and of the penal retribution of the unrighteous, whether Jew or heathen. 'Day' thus ceased to connote Victory, and became a synonym for Assize or Judgment. Hence ἡμέρα could be used by St. Paul in 1 Co 4[3] in this simple sense of 'judgment.' In 2 P 3[12] 'The Day of God' is used for the final destruction of this universe by fire. The trumpet call is also a favourite apocalyptic symbol, and finds its place, as we have seen, in Mt 24[31], and in St. Paul in 1 Th 4[16] and 1 Co 15[52]. In the Sibylline Oracles it signals the final conflagration which burns up the whole earth; and in 2 Es 6[23] it is mentioned in close connexion with the opening of the Books for Judgment. The trumpeter is the archangel Michael. Seven blasts were traditionally to be expected, and accordingly we find in the Revelation (8[2]–11[15]) seven trumpets sounded by the seven angels of the Presence. Possibly St. Paul's 'last trump' may be the last of a series.

Entre Nous.

G. A. Studdert Kennedy.

There died on March 7th of this year a man who was greatly loved—Geoffrey Studdert Kennedy, or to give him his familiar war-time name—'Woodbine Willie.' He was only forty-six, and there is no doubt that he literally wore himself out. A memoir has been prepared by six of his friends, and published by Hodder & Stoughton (5s. net). The account of his home life and early years in the ministry is by the Rev. J. K. Mozley, D.D.; his life in Worcester by the Dean of Worcester; his war work by the Dean of Guernsey (late Assistant Chaplain-General). The chapter entitled 'Studdert Kennedy, a Friend,' is by Dr. H. R. L. Sheppard, and the 'Man and his Message,' by the Archbishop of York; while the account of his Industrial Christian Fellowship work—on which he was engaged at the time of his death—is by the General Director of the I.C.F., the Rev. P. T. R. Kirk. Chapters from such pens could not but make good reading. And it is difficult to conceive a subject with a more interesting and many-sided personality.

Dr. Mozley describes Kennedy during the time that he was curate at Rugby, where Dr. A. V. Baillie was rector. All the traits of the man as he was then and later are touched on, and so we will quote a couple of paragraphs:

'It was a somewhat simple churchman who met Kennedy after the delivery of his very first sermon in Holy Trinity Church, with the remark, "I want to thank you for your sermon: of course most people thought it very bad, but it was a great help to me"—a story that Kennedy loved. Probably the reason that "most people thought it bad," was that Kennedy never seemed in those days to care whether what he said was orthodox or not. He wanted to get at the truth, and his mind was too independent, and, it must be added, too lacking in balance of view, for him to confine himself to lines laid down by others. It is on record that on one occasion the Rector took action on this point: "Kennedy," he said, "I can stand one heresy from you each Sunday, but I cannot and will not stand two," a judgment that reduced Kennedy to guffaws of laughter and promises of amendment.

In this connexion the most noticeable characteristic of Kennedy was his humility. It is seldom, I think, that such great mental capacity is so entirely free from self-assertion and the spirit of dogmatism. And this humility was at once extraordinarily attractive, and a source of intellectual power, for he always saw that Truth was a bigger thing than he could grasp, and that opinions he disliked had probably got some truth in them that he had missed. In consequence, he was always a learner. Moreover he was entirely unacademic. Not only was his mind out of tune with a purely scholastic atmosphere, but it was impossible for him to dissociate his thought of God from his love for men. For him the setting and the stage of religion was this world, and his own intense humanness kept his intellectual side harnessed, if not subordinate, to his pastoral work. I can see again that small slim figure strolling into the unattractive Public House where his beloved lodging-house tramps were to be found, and standing up in the bar in his cassock to sing "Nazareth," while half his audience "felt within a power unfelt before." They loved him—loved him for his great laugh, the smile that transformed his face, the inimitable Irish brogue, but most of all because of his love for them.'

Of the six friends who have written about him, J. K. Mozley probably knew him best. He had certainly known him longest, for they were at school together—at the Leeds Grammar School, and Mozley saw a great deal of him in his happy home life at St. Mary's Vicarage, '*the* Vicarage as I came to call it.' He kept in touch with him when he was at Trinity College, Dublin, and at Ripon Clergy College; when he was a curate at Rugby, and when he came back to St. Mary's to help his father, by this time an old man, and he it was who on St. Mark's Day, 1914, married him to Miss Emily Catlow. When the War broke out, Kennedy was vicar of St. Paul's, Worcester. In speaking of the long arguments they had together, Mr. Mozley recalls Kennedy's dissent from 'an article on "Punishment," which I had contributed to The Expository Times. The editor probably considered his reply to be rather too violent for insertion.' Did that letter of dissent ever reach the editorial offices of this magazine? It would be interesting to know.

Studdert Kennedy's war work is too well known to need comment. He met the men's needs better, probably, than any other chaplain. He was in France from 1915 until the end of the War, and he won the M.C. for conspicuous bravery. And this is what he says about war: 'There are no fruits of victory, no such thing as victory in modern war. War is a universal disaster, and as far as I am concerned, I'm through.'

A letter which he wrote to his wife about the training of his son, Patrick, is too revealing not to be quoted, and we give it below:

A Boy's Training.

'1. Make him a sportsman. Encourage him to play games and always to play the game.

'2. Teach him to despise cowardice and never to be afraid of anything or anyone save God.

'3. Teach him as soon as you can what his body is for, about his powers of procreation, and about the necessity of cleanliness in body and mind.

'4. Teach him to tell you everything about himself, and specially everything of that sort.

'5. Teach him that being a gentleman means using your life to serve and help your fellow-men as much as ever you can, and that it is dishonourable to desire only to make money and be comfortable. If he has brains teach him that he must use them to lead men on to better things, and to teach them a gentleman should choose one of the poorly paid but honourable professions.

'6. Teach him to love and reverence women. Encourage him when young to have plenty of girl friends, and to treat them as comrades and never to play with them and deceive them. Teach him that the man who deceives a woman is a scoundrel and that he must try to live straight.

'7. Last, and most important, about his religion. Teach him to love Jesus Chirst as the pattern God-Man. Teach him that, and leave him free. Don't force his religion in any way, especially if he has brains. There are bound to be in these coming years very rapid developments in Christian thought, let him go his way, and do not be pained or shocked so long as he keeps his love of Jesus Christ. If he wants to become a priest, let him, but never force him any way. Only teach him constantly that a gentleman must give not get, must serve and not be served.

'Guard him from vulgarity and snobbishness, and never let him speak contemptuously of any one or anything except a coward.

'I think that is all. Kiss him for me and give him my blessing, and when he is old enough tell him my life story as you would tell it, knowing that I tried hard most of the time to do right, and when I sinned was sorry in my heart, as I am now.

'I don't believe I am going to be killed, but I don't know, and any way I am content, so long as God can comfort you.'[1]

The Indian Ferment.

Mr. C. F. Andrews writes an introduction to *The Indian Ferment*, by Mr. H. G. Alexander (Williams & Norgate; 7s. 6d. net). He says that he felt it ought to be published because it has given with remarkably keen observation a description of the ferment of thought in India and the racial feeling aroused.

'It is supremely necessary to appreciate this Indian ferment in England at once, in order that a great calamity may be avoided. For unless especially the younger generation in England, which should naturally sympathize with Young India in its present revolutionary mood, can understand what is taking place, there may be perpetrated once more in our own times one of those ghastly tragedies of human history not altogether dissimilar from that which took place in Ireland just after the War.' Mr. Alexander describes his book as 'A Traveller's Sketch Book, Nothing More.' His first words are: 'On reaching a new country my first tendency is to use my eyes and to look at the country itself. This is partly because I am on the look-out for new birds.' This man who is on the look-out for new birds has made delightfully interesting that which is generally a very dry business, an account of an itinerary day by day. Some one to whom we handed on the book returned it with the remark, 'I had no intention of reading it, but when I picked it up I could not help going on.'

Mr. Alexander is a Quaker, and he has a 'concern' for opium-smoking India—the object of his journey was to investigate the trade. The results are not given here, but there are many passing allusions.

Opium-smoking is to India what drinking is to Scotland. Of the village of Tinsukia he says: 'We found the men, each in his miserable hovel (you can tell an opium-addict's house at a glance from the others), smoking his morning pipe over a little fire of sticks, while his half-naked children stood shivering round, or tried to begin to do some of the work the incapable father could no longer do. And it was here at Tinsukia, too, that we saw the most pathetic opium victim: a youth of twenty-one, a beggar, unable to walk on his legs, who took such a heavy daily dose that he required half as much again as the maximum monthly allowance under the new rationing system. This he gets from the opium-vendor out of what remains over from short weight sold to other customers. He spends nearly a rupee a day on opium; but easily gets that much by begging. This opium shop was close to the railway station and junction. If you reflect upon this tale it reveals many things.'

What is the conclusion of this Quaker investigator about the political position in India? He speaks out boldly. 'We can no longer rule India against the will of her two million (or is it ten million?) educated sons. There is only one honest course: it needs bold statesmanship and rare imagination; but it is not impossible. We must yield what they crave, yield full responsibility. . . . There seem to be only two alternatives: to yield full responsibility, or to rule by the sword. The third way, the way of gradually increasing responsibility of Indians in partnership with British, is blocked; for the leaders of India will not co-operate. . . . If we do the bold, imaginative thing; if, putting aside force or the threat of force, we honestly ask the acknowledged leaders of India to meet our representatives on equal terms, to make a treaty of friendship between India and Britain, I believe we shall find that their terms will be surprisingly easy.'

---

[1] *G. A. Studdert Kennedy*, 104.

Christ in Flanders.

The Rev. P. B. Clayton, M.C., the Founder of Talbot House in Poperinghe, has a definite purpose in publishing *Plain Tales from Flanders* (Longmans; 3s. 6d. net). It is that we may not rest content with reading what 'Dean Colet would have called the "blotterature" of the war period.' The sixteen chapters, which make up the book—the bundle of a man's memories—are to show us that that 'blotterature' is not true. 'There is no greater impoverishment,' says Mr. Clayton, 'in our hymn-book than the loss of the word "young" as Watts wrote it:

"When I survey the wondrous Cross
Where the young Prince of Glory died."

And He who died at thirty-three, after three years of ministry which set the world eternally aflame, most truly walked with these [the men who died on Flanders' fields] and welcomed them.'

It is a book of stories, some short and some long, but all true. One chapter is entitled Herbert Fleming, 'well-nigh the first padre in Flanders.' 'One scrap of Fleming's proverbial wisdom lingers on in my memory to explain his habit of mind. "God," he once said, "is not content with loving people. He positively likes them."'

The message of the book is twofold—first, that out there in Flanders His covenant was renewed; and second, that 'they' have their covenant with us to-day. His Covenant was renewed.

'There, in the dark of a dug-out, the fine old colonel admits that he never goes to sleep until he has said his evening hymn.

'There, crouched in the shell-hole, one man pulls out the Gospels and reads silently, until the others tell him to read aloud.

'There, in the outer darkness, struggling back from the Menin Road, is a stretcher-bearer alone with a badly wounded man. A gas-cloud overwhelms them, and the wounded man has lost his gas-mask. Yet in the morning light a mask is found upon his face, with the stretcher-bearer stifling beside him.

'There in a sunken cellar, or there in a crazy garret, the Upper Room renews its grace with a new meaning; for now it is the ever-living Lord who feeds them, and the disciples who have come to find strength to die.'

And they have their covenant with us to-day. '"Do not deceive yourselves," they would say; "do not imagine that an age of supreme sacrifice can well be followed by an age of supreme self-indulgence. Our day is at its close, but realize from this moment onwards that, whatever else is left undone, our work must be accomplished by you, or fall and fail for ever. Your age, which has entered into an inheritance which we purchased, will not lack its sufficiency of ambitious and successful men. Let some of you be ambitious and successful in a deeper direction. Be ambitious to undergird this stricken ship of England. Be ambitious to serve the cause of Christ with every silent power within you. Be ambitious to devote your lives to the spreading of a new spirit between man and man; to give one child a chance, which but for your thought of us, it would not have; to turn one dark to light; to win one new disciple to our Captain's cause. These are the things we ask of you, as you look back and see once more from the hills, where you now stand in the morning light, our bones in the valley behind you."'

Printed by Morrison & Gibb Limited, Tanfield Works,
and Published by T. & T. Clark, 38 George Street,
Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to The Editor, Kings
Gate, Aberdeen, Scotland.

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

THE modern churchmen have at length come, in their annual conference, to the question of Authority in Religion. The Sixteenth Conference it was, and it was held in September at Girton College, Cambridge. The papers are all printed in the current number of *The Modern Churchman* (Blackwell; 4s. net). The same problem has twice been before the Conference of Congregationalists. It is to be feared they did not make very much of it. And on the showing of these papers, it may be hazarded that the modern churchmen have not been much more successful.

Our present purpose, however, is to draw attention to one of the most interesting of the essays read at the Conference. The title is 'A Corpus of Sacred Writings,' and the real subject may be presumed to be the authority of the Bible. The writer is Professor BURKITT. He begins by drawing attention to a striking fact, that a Corpus of sacred writings is not found in every religion. The only one that has such a Corpus is Muhammadanism, and the Koran is an imitation of, or rather a substitute for, the Bible. Without the Bible the existence of the Koran is unthinkable. The Greek and Roman religious systems had no Bible, no Corpus containing the essentials of religion. The nearest thing was the Iliad, and it was only possible to illustrate a religion from that, not to construct one.

A second point made by Dr. BURKITT is that the acceptance of the written Law (and it was their first Bible) produced a democratic, what may be called a lay, element in orthodox religion. It was an essential part of the religion of the Law that the Law was to be known by every Israelite and that it was to be practised. The will of God for priest and layman was written down in black and white, plain for all to read. During the trying times when Hellenism was being forced on the Jews it was not the priesthood but the people who remained obstinately loyal. And the reason is that study and meditation in their Bible had made them passionately attached to it.

So much by way of preliminary. Dr. BURKITT comes next to his real subject: what is required or desired in a Corpus of sacred writings. And the first desideratum is that it be *essentially true.* He makes this point because he thinks that the plea for continuing to teach the Bible on the ground that it is splendid literature is beside the mark. Either there is a sense in which we can say that the Bible is true and helps us to get at truth in a way that nothing else can, or it will drop out of use. Is the Bible true? Or, to put it historically, did the Bible guide the Jews, and afterwards the Christians, into true views of their religion?

There are, of course, many things in the Bible that are not historically true. The world was not made in six days, to take an obvious instance. And *a propos* of that, Dr. BURKITT interjects:

'It is no use to say that the Bible was meant to teach us religious knowledge, not geology or profane history. That excuse was only invented when it was found that the geology and history plainly indicated in fundamental portions of the Bible were not true.' Is Dr. BURKITT right in this? Would it not be truer to say that the fact was discovered when a better view of the Bible was attained? And is it not as a matter of fact the simple truth to say that the Bible was never written to teach us science, but to tell us about God? That is one of the liberating discoveries of modern times, that it would be as sane to expect to learn the day of the week from your watch as to expect to find modern science in the Bible. The watch was made to tell the time, and for no other purpose.

In what sense, then, is the Bible true? It is serious history. On the whole it gives a true picture of the rise and progress of religion and of the events which made the religion. How valuable it is we see when it stops! We are helpless about the period from Nebuchadrezzar to Darius because we have not the history that has guided us hitherto. And it is to be remembered that this historical Bible picture was set before the Jews centuries before Livy, and at least a couple of generations before Herodotus. It is not modern scientific history. It is homiletic, didactic, but it is real, serious, and substantially sound.

The second desideratum of the Bible is that what we need is not there ready made; a certain effort of application on our part is needed. This sounds obscure and even cryptic. What does it mean? Perhaps Dr. BURKITT supplies the key when he goes on to say that the use of the Bible for Christians is that it leads up to Jesus Christ. If eventually we are to 'leave the Cross as we have left carved gods,' we may possibly 'guard the fire within,' but we shall not keep the Bible very long. This is the uniqueness of the Bible that it enshrines the Incarnation. And if we find Jesus central to our religion, we shall find the Bible essential. The use of the Bible is to tell us about Jesus Christ.

But the Bible can only retain its authority on the ground that what it tells us about is of primary importance. And if there be any truth in the fundamental postulate of Christian doctrine, that about nineteen hundred years ago something happened which is still of vital importance to us, then the documents which preserve the record of this, or help us to understand it better, remain of vital importance. In the nature of things there could not be any substitute for this Bible.

It is justly a matter of surprise that we have only four Gospels in the New Testament. That surprise is justified by the unceasing succession of lives of Jesus down all the files of time. As significant are the characterizations which appear in every age, especially when a more patient scholarship, or a new phase of thought, quickens men's minds. To-day the interest, not only of the Christian Church, but of all moral and religious thinkers is fastened intently on His personality. Men care, and inquire eagerly, not about His miracles and not even always into His sayings. They scan and estimate His actions, His choices, His decisions. But their object is to understand and to explain His personality. That, as a great teacher once said, is the penalty which greatness imposes. It was never more evident than in the interpretation of Jesus in our day.

This fact is determining not only our studies of the Gospels but our use of them. With Paul, and the noble succession to that great master, the interest consummated on the doctrine which a study of the life and teaching would yield. Christ's sayings and doings were read and analysed for the truths of God's mind and purpose and will toward men, and their salvation from sin and its penalties. To-day they are regarded more frequently as lights held up to shine upon Christ's face. Men are less anxious about their souls. What quickens the attention of even a sluggish-minded audience, and rouses a careless reader into alert attention, is a fresh portraiture of Jesus, with a resetting of the incidents, and a searching interpretation of the ruling declarations of His message to men.

Here in *The Epic of the Nazarene*, by the Rev. A. G. Paisley, M.A., B.A. (James Clarke; 6s. net), there is a striking instance of this feature. The writer states that he has aimed at 'a presentation of Christ's redeeming work as a conflict with evil.' But, as Professor McFadyen writes in his preface, 'we appreciate with a new vision how truly Jesus was also the Son of Man, yet standing apart in loneliness unutterable.' To our gain, what Mr. Paisley really gives us is not a presentation of Christ's work: it is a new vision, with an impressive appeal to realize it, and to face its issues for our faith and obedience.

At the outset the writer declares that what we need to understand Jesus is 'the right predicate.' As he proves, there is no single right predicate. The attempt to focus on a single right predicate has led many astray, as may be seen at a glance in the instance of 'Ecce Homo.' We need many predicates to present our vision of Jesus. That is the truth set in the appealing title of this book—*The Epic of the Nazarene.* It is Jesus as Hero, in His conflict with evil—so lonely, so unfaltering, so triumphant—which is presented. The greater number of the characterizations of Jesus are lyric. They are touched to sweet music, even to song. It is Jesus, clad in the armour of His love unspeakable, His faith that never failed, His courage which never flinched, even at the grim face of death on the Cross, who appears here on every page.

In this portraiture Jesus is first depicted, to a reader's surprise, in His glory on the Mount of Transfiguration. That splendid and noble incident is chosen because it records the most expressive and revealing presentation of Christ's self-conscious realization of His mission as the Protagonist of evil, bearing the imprint of the Divine upon His face, following in the great succession of God's heroes, and, most significantly, 'coming down' from the Mount into the arena of the conflict. That is the index to all His chivalries, and to their cost. Up to that great day He had been engaged in the never-faltering contest with evil, in all its many forms and issues. Now, He looks out to its utmost strain and anguish. It is therefore significant that, as he 'sets his face to go to Jerusalem,' there comes the voice of high approval, 'This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased.'

In the light of this determining and revealing episode the author passes the course of Christ's ministry under review. The conflict with evil is set out with a certain dramatic vividness and intensity. Beginning with the conception of His conflict, under Christ's own figure of 'The Cup' He must drink, he describes Jesus as entering upon a fourfold conflict with evil. There is the clash with the ideals held by the people of the meaning of the Kingdom of God; the fiercer personal conflict with His own temptation; the cost and strain of disease as the issue and adjunct of evil. Then, in the last section, He is pictured coming to men in the closing episodes of His ministry, meeting all the adverse circumstances of life, and finally of death, even on the Cross.

The freshness and definiteness of this portraiture of Jesus, as not only a Conqueror but more than a Conqueror, is greatly enhanced by the energy of the expression and the impassioned devotion of the style. This is the work of a disciple. The Central Figure holds his eyes. Ever and again, as he seems to lift them from his page, he sees Jesus in the midst of an evil world, among gainsaying and scorning, and even deserting men; and then is set down a sentence of arresting emphasis. The citations are fresh, many of them from unexpected quarters. The writer's acquaintance with a large range of English poetry, and his knowledge of French literature stand him in good stead. It is a book of great promise, especially as it comes from one who has left the student's bench little more than a year ago.

Church union is in the air. The Churches in Scotland have united, and the Methodist Churches in England are on the verge of union. In connexion with this latter a wise thing has been done. A volume has been published—*Methodism in the Modern World* (Epworth Press; 6s. net)—which gives an authoritative statement of the Message and Mission of Methodism as understood by its leading exponents. It is a profoundly Christian book, with nothing sectarian in it, a book which may be read with profit by members of all denominations.

One of the most arresting papers is on 'Methodist Evangelism,' by Dr. J. E. Rattenbury, a man in whose veins the spirit of evangelism leaps like fire. He reviews the elements of the evangel as preached by the Wesleys and their first followers. He shows how, as Methodism settled down to respectable domesticity till its ministers became 'pastors of the flock, and their concern was the ninety and nine, not the one,' the original fires were from time to time relighted by the grace of God. There came the outbreak of Primitive Methodism, the rise of the Salvation Army and the Wesleyan Forward Movement associated with the name of Hugh Price Hughes. In all these movements the accent of the preaching may have differed in immaterial particulars, but the message was 'in every essential matter the message of the Wesleys,' and it found the response of the people as enthusiastic and uncritical as it was in the earlier periods. 'It was the preaching of God's love to sinful men, and the gospel of immediate salvation for those who submitted to Christ and trusted Him.'

The question has to be faced, Can we preach the same gospel to-day? Will it grip the men of our generation as it gripped in former times? The difficulties are confessedly great. We have entered a new spiritual climate. New intellectual influences are at work, and old beliefs, common to evangelists and people, do not exist. 'The people have little fear of God, and hell has no terrors for them. The sense of sin is less acute, and, although there is a vague belief in a Heavenly Father, and a general admiration of Jesus as a hero and friend of the people, there is little sense of a living Christ who died to save men from their sins. The feeling of grievance is greater than the sense of sin. Many men feel themselves victims of social, and not violators of Divine, law. The heaven they seek for is not of the other world, but is a secular city in this world, for the next generation. In a word, the opinions, sentiments, and enthusiasms of the people have changed more in the last two decades than in the sixteen which preceded them.'

It may be asserted with confidence that no evangelistic campaign has ever been successful, nor is ever likely to be, unless it contain four essentials. There must be first a gospel; second, a gospel as experienced and witnessed by those who have experienced it; third, a gospel declared by men who stake their lives on its truth; fourth, a gospel declared in language and thought-forms intelligible to the people.

The first essential is a dogmatic message, a gospel, genuine good news. 'You cannot preach salvation unless it is from something into something.' Have we such a message to-day? It may well give us deep searchings of heart when we reflect that the Church seems to believe the gospel very faintly and those outside her hardly at all. 'How many of us really believe that it makes much difference in the light of eternity whether a man becomes a Christian now or not? How many preachers think that eternal destiny hangs upon the acceptance or rejection of their message? How often do we preach in such a way as to feel that people have missed something that really mattered when they did not hear us? How deeply do we feel that those who are indifferent to Christianity are lost sheep who must be sought until we find them? How far are we gripped by the notions fundamental to effective evangelism of God's judgments, of men's sins, and men's need of salvation?' These questions must be faced and answered. The acid test of a gospel is its power or powerlessness with the crude sinner. We must have a dynamic gospel ere we can hope to make a successful attack on the world's unbelief.

The second essential is a gospel 'experienced and witnessed by its experients.' Experience is the vital spark that sets the message on fire. 'If a body of the most incontrovertible truths could be drawn up by the most infallible of committees and read out to the British public, it would be as ineffective as the recital of the Athanasian Creed. Religious truth can only be communicated when it is set on fire by conviction and experience. Evangelism is not the communication of concepts, but the personal transmission of truths that are alive; it is really the communication of life. The story of Wesley is one of the best of many illustrations of this. He preached salvation by faith in London churches, and nothing happened except that he was forbidden to preach in them a second time, until his heart was set on fire, and then he still roused opponents, but he set other hearts aflame, so that the fire spread.'

The third essential is a gospel preached by men who stake their lives and comfort on its truth. The typical modern minister, with his settled home and comfortable income, with his pipe and golf clubs and his long holidays, seems at times strangely incongruous as successor of the holy apostles and preachers of the Cross. True evangelism must have the sacrificial spirit behind it. John Wesley, tireless when nearly ninety, still preached the gospel in the open air. Hugh Price Hughes died at fifty-five, a strong man worn out by service. General Booth said, 'The doctors gave me up, so I gave up the doctors.'

The fourth essential is that the gospel be preached in language and thought-forms intelligible to the people. Can we make an effective Christian appeal to the men of our day, with their changed mentality? It may be difficult, but we are not without our *points d'appui*. 'The general belief that God is good and kind is one. It may be that on that basis people will see that God would not even be good and kind unless He were just—and justice implies judgment. Perhaps we might get back in that way to the Cross of Christ, which means both judgment and love, as the chief evidence of the goodness of God. But we have another approach in the common admiration of Jesus. It is true that the Jesus honoured by the people is more of a Socialist than a Saviour, but He still remains their hero. If we can begin with Jesus the teacher and hero, we are on the way to Jesus the crucified Saviour, who did not only die, but lives to save.' Further, there is this. The salvation that Wesley taught was 'holiness of heart and life,' including 'love to our neighbour.' Here is the great opportunity of the new evangelism. 'Not with a piping voice, but with the sound of a trumpet, we must preach the whole gospel of personal salvation and social service, and, whatever it means, have no fear of giving actual expression to love of our neighbour. It is imperative that social service should not be substituted for evangelical religion, as it sometimes has been, but be shown to be one of its integral characteristics. We cannot teach that the unfortunate are merely victims of society, but nevertheless the gospel of salvation must be preached not only as a gospel of personal redemption, but also of social reconstruction, if we are to reach this age, and if, indeed, we are to preach the whole gospel of the New Testament.'

No one fully understands life who has little experience of failure, pain, and sorrow. Civilization may hope for, and aim at, the elimination of these things; but it is more than doubtful whether they will ever be eliminated. For many, perhaps for most, these three abide, as surely as faith, hope, and love. And if by some inconceivable chance they could be entirely eliminated, it is as certain as anything can be that human life would be not the richer, but the poorer.

The supreme figure in human history is a man of sorrows. Doubtless, in perfectly fulfilling the Father's will, He also knew of a joy unutterable, nevertheless He is truly described as a man of sorrows and acquainted with grief. How different He is from the magnanimous man of Aristotle who lives in an atmosphere of unruffled calm, who stands to his less fortunate fellow-mortals in an attitude of superiority and aloofness, and who claims much because he knows himself to deserve much. The Greeks and their ideals will for ever exercise a fascination over the minds of educated men; but the Hebrew Sufferer on His cross is nearer the everlasting secret of things. Nay, He is at the very centre.

Pain and sorrow, if the spirit responds to the subtle ministry with which they are fraught, bring power and insight. By the unwise they may be resented as intrusions; but, if they come into our life without any seeking on our part, they should be welcomed as opportunities. They furnish us with the means of growth in patience, understanding, and sympathy. They may, indeed, be gifts of God, to be numbered perhaps even among the choicest of His gifts. Through the thorn in the flesh may come a revelation of the exceeding grace and power of God. Even the Captain of our salvation was made perfect through suffering.

Suffering, alike of body and spirit, is so interwoven with human existence that he is the best minister, whether officially or unofficially, to that existence who has some experience of suffering in his own person. There are many sympathetic persons, thank God, in our difficult world, but there is a vast difference between those who are only sympathetic in intention and those who have the sympathy that is born of experience. The former stand outside the trouble they would heal, the latter stand within it. Only those who have themselves at some time and in some way been smitten can inwardly understand the sorrow and the anguish of the innumerable sick and mutilated folk who crowd the infirmaries and the hospitals of the world, or of the lonely sufferers in humble homes who are stricken with intolerable pain or incurable disease. The word that helps and cheers is the word spoken by one whose own soul or body has been scorched by the fires of affliction. He can speak not only of the things which he has heard and seen, but of the things which his own hands have handled and his own heart has lived through.

These grim experiences, when we know them at first hand, not only link us by bonds of affectionate and understanding sympathy with the great brotherhood of pain and sorrow throughout the world, they also help us to see our own lives in their true perspective. A fractured limb or a wearing sickness which incapacitates a man for weeks or months from the work which he loves, enables him to see how relatively unimportant he and his work are in the vast scheme of things within which he may have fondly fancied he was indispensable. He is set aside, but the great work of the world goes merrily on without him. This is an experience as wholesome as it is humbling. Every true man wishes to play his part like a man, but that part may not be quite so important as he fancied it to be. He has things of vital moment to learn which simply cannot be learned when his health is good and his work is prosperous and his sky is fair; and in the providence of God he may get his first glimmer of the meaning of those things when he is lying on his back on a bed of pain or weakness.

His natural impulse may be to resent this seemingly cruel interference with his happy and useful activities. Wherefore this waste? he may ask. If he is of a reflective turn, he may humbly or haughtily demand an explanation of the pain or sorrow which has laid him low and which he now begins to perceive is scattered far more widely across the lives of men than ever he had dreamt before. He may not readily find an answer. But if he looks at the loveliness of the opening rose or listens to the careless rapture of the lark, he will get a new glimpse into the gracious meaning of the world, which should help to silence his doubts and sustain his soul. He is himself a part of that system which has brought forth the birds and the flowers and happy and lovely things innumerable.

The man who daily lives in sight of the Cross will not need to fortify his soul by such an argument. But the perplexed and embittered sufferer to whom Jesus is a stranger, may well, like Job, win not only comfort but strength from the contemplation of a universe which is crowded with so many tokens of the tenderness and the wisdom of the Spirit that controls it all. The familiar lines of Robert

Louis Stevenson come home to him with exalted meaning:

> The world is so full of a number of things,
> I'm sure we should all be as happy as kings.

Our patience and faith are reinforced, we are enabled to endure cheerfully and to go forward hopefully, when we begin to understand that behind the mighty system within which we with our pains and perplexities stand, there is something, or rather some One, who loves beauty and gladness and who wishes all His creatures well.

The Words from the Cross.

I. 'Father, forgive them' (Lk. xxiii. 34).

By the Reverend James Reid, M.A., Eastbourne.

There is no bigger test of the real quality of a man's spirit than his attitude to those who wrong him, and especially at the moment when the wrong is being done. That is a test which we all accept, however badly we may meet it ourselves. It is a test which Christ Himself laid down. 'If ye love them that love you, what do ye more than others?'—the ordinary man can rise to that level. But this is the real test of your quality—the distinguishing mark of your spiritual worth—to 'love them that hate you, and to pray for them that despitefully use you.' These words of the Sermon on the Mount have been read and studied a million times through the centuries, and time after time people who read them have laid down the book with a sigh of despair, telling themselves and others that the thing cannot be done. Yet the words stand, and challenge us to-day, because He who spoke them passed His own test, and passed it triumphantly. For, as Matthew tells us, when they crucified Him, and had done their devilish work on His poor body, and while He hung writhing in such agony as we cannot even imagine, and looked into faces that were livid with hatred and bitter with scorn—the faces of those He came to love into a new life—His first word was a literal prayer for His enemies, 'Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do.'

There is something very precious about all last words. We listen carefully for some message from lips that will soon speak no more on this earth, because we long, perhaps, for one last word of love. Or it may be we have a feeling that when the shadows are falling on everything, and things begin to stand out in the perspective of eternity, something will be said which will be big with meaning. And many of the most significant things ever said have come from those who, looking their last on this fever of life, 'saw it steadily and saw it whole,' and knew at that moment, with startling clearness, the true from the false. But there is something uniquely precious about the last words of Jesus, and especially about this. For it tells how He felt towards those who were wronging Him, and there are moments when that is a thing we most of all want to be sure of. But it also reveals the fact that the thing most worth doing, in relation to one another, is to forgive. He had no breath to waste at that moment, no mind to give to trivial things, and this is what He did: He prayed and said, 'Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do.' Does it not rebuke our petulance, our pride, the stupid irritations that cloud our relationships, the easily offended spirit that springs from self-centredness, to realize that all He found time for, when life was ebbing away, was an act of forgiving love?

Let us think of this prayer, and what it suggests to us.

I.

First of all, think what it suggests to us about Him. There is no picture in which we can more fully catch the glory of Jesus than this. The character of Jesus was often revealed in little things. His life was so unified, so harmonious, that everything He did was a bit of self-revelation. But this prayer holds in it the very essence of His spirit. It was not a supreme effort to which He rose—something unexpected and unique—it was the whole spirit of His life brought to a focus. If we want to see a portrait of Jesus, caught, so to speak, in the attitude that most reveals His glory, watch Him as He prays on the Cross for the people who were doing Him to death and, as they thought, smashing His life-work into ruins and putting out His light for ever.

Is it not something wonderful that at that moment He was not thinking of Himself? If there was ever a time when He might have been pardoned for being self-centred it was then. For His whole frame was held in one unspeakable agony of pain; and there is nothing like physical pain for fixing our attention on ourselves. Yet, at this moment, He was thinking of others.

And He was thinking not of what they were doing to Him, but of what they were doing to themselves. That is what hurt Him most. 'Weep not for me,' He said to the women by the Via Dolorosa. For He knew that in crucifying Him they were putting out the light in their own souls. They were doing violence to every fine impulse that was still unstifled. They were destroying themselves. The worst reactions of evil, its deepest consequences, are always within. They are the blinding of the inner eye, the hardening of the heart, the loss of the power to distinguish between good and evil—that moral sensitiveness without which a man goes back to the beasts, or lower than the beasts. As Christ looked at them, and what they were doing, He had the same feeling as a lover of beautiful flowers might have who sees some callous foot trample down a tender blossom on which he has spent his care, and in whose beauty he sees the very tracing of God's finger. We get a glimpse here, in the soul of Jesus praying for His enemies, of what sin means to the heart of God—an infinite disaster—but not to Himself, nor any slight to His *amour propre*, which is what we often think it to be. It is the defilement of something into which He has put the breath of His Spirit, and the very genius of His creative love. That is what sin means to God—the destruction and the degradation of that in us which is dear to Him as His own self, and of that purpose of love which seeks fulfilment through our lives.

As Christ thought of His enemies, He saw them through the eyes of a great pity. It was they who needed help, not Himself. It was they who needed to be saved, to be recovered, to be rescued from their own self-defiling hands, and to be restored to love, and to God. So the cry that might, on other lips, have been a curse, turned into a prayer for blessing. When we thus see Christ victorious over His own pain, and over the hurt that sin was doing Him, and that, not in a lofty stoicism, but in a yearning pity which was utterly unselfish, and when we look, and look again, at this triumphant sufferer, it is then we catch the lustre of His Divinity. In that remarkable story of 'A Gentleman in Prison,' which describes how a Japanese criminal, condemned to death for brutal murders, was changed by reading the New Testament, there is an interesting light on this fact. A copy of the New Testament had been given to him by a lady missionary. One day, bored with idleness, he took it down, and began to read. But he was only mildly interested. He felt that Christ must be a good man, a man who sought to help others into the path of virtue. But one day, later on, he took the book down, and read the story of the Crucifixion. He knew all about that, for he was versed in brutality. 'I went on,' he says, 'and my attention was next taken by these words, "Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do." I stopped. I was stabbed to the heart, as if pierced by a five-inch nail. What did the verse reveal to me? Shall I call it the love of the heart of Christ? Shall I call it His compassion? I do not know what to call it; I only know that, with an unspeakably grateful heart, I believed. Through that simple sentence I was led into the whole heart of Christianity. That is how I thought it out. I suppose a man's greatest enemy is the one who seeks to take his life from him. Now at the very moment when Jesus's life was being taken from Him, He prayed for His enemies to the God of Heaven, "Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do." What else could I believe but that He was indeed the Son of God?'

How did He win this victory? How did the natural resentment of this pain become transformed into the desire to bless? There is one secret; it is His love. It was because He had ceased caring for Himself, and cared only for others, and as He thought of them and their need, by that alchemy of love the very blows they were showering on Him awoke the sense of pity for them. Booker Washington, who rose from the slavery in which he was born into a place of real greatness, refused to let the insults that were heaped on him affect his spirit. 'I will not allow another man,' he said, 'to demean me so far as to make me hate him.' That sounds fine; but there is an element of pride in it that spoils it. Christ's attitude was far greater, for He did not think of Himself at all. His attitude was that He would not allow anything men might do to Him to stop His loving. Is not here the real secret of the victory of the forgiving spirit? It is to ask of one who wrongs us, 'How can I help him to become a better man? How can I transform that chill current of spite, or enmity, into a stream of love and goodwill? How can I change him into a friend? How can I help to free him from that meanness, that bitterness, or selfishness?' That question would change our whole reaction to people who have done us wrong; and if our hands should be helpless, and words at the moment be futile, we can do what Christ did. We can pray, 'Father, forgive them,' and by that chain of prayer bind them with us about the feet of God.

> They drew a circle that shut me out,
> Heretic, rebel—a thing to flout.
> But Love and I had the wit to win,
> We drew a circle that shut them in.

II.

Think now of the second part of the prayer. It is rather startling. 'Forgive them,' Christ prays, 'for they know not what they do.' That is a charitable addition we sometimes make to our harsh judgments. But was it no more than that with Christ? We cannot look deeply into it without feeling that He meant it. They did not know what they were doing. That was a fact, and Christ realized it. They did not know, for one thing, that they were crucifying the Son of God. We look with horror on these people, as if they were the greatest criminals in history. But were they deliberately so, and realizing it? The truth is they did not know that they were crucifying the Son of God. They had no understanding of the place that to-day we give to Jesus. They did not even realize Him as a world teacher. For them He was merely a peasant—a carpenter—an upstart who was threatening the religious ideas and conventions on which their lives were built. He was a revolutionary, whose teaching was highly dangerous. Turn to the second chapter of Mark, and you will find set out there the things that first awoke their hostility and suspicion, and made them feel that somehow He must be got rid of. They were very simple things—His claim that the good of men was greater than religious rules; His habit of making friends of outcasts and prodigals—the religiously disreputable people; His refusal to fast when He felt happy, even though it was a religious observance; and His assurance to a man whose secret conscience was breaking his peace, that his sins were forgiven. It was, of course, a challenge to their whole hard loveless system of religion. It meant a new outlook—that persons are worth more than property, that the true aristocracy is neither in wealth nor power nor self-conscious goodness, but in lowly self-forgetting service. They felt that His teaching involved the loss of their power and privilege; and it is very difficult to see straight when these things are threatened. It is hard to be quite honest with conscience and truth when vested interests, money, or social prestige are in the balance. How many people to-day would take truth from the lips of a village carpenter? They did not realize that they were turning their backs on the light of life, opposing God's will, rejecting His love, and destroying the very sacred in the Person of Jesus. They did not realize the consequences of their action, how by their refusal to take His way of love their minds were hardening to a course that in a few years would bring Jerusalem to the dust in a conflict with the Roman power. There was a time when they were faced with the light and refused to be sincere with it. The result was a conflict within, in which some of them at least were conscious that He was right—a conflict which added fuel to their fire of resentment. Now they were blind; they knew not what they did. Their real motives were hidden from them, as ours often are. They were moved by dim half-conscious things that stirred fear and hatred in their blood. They were not bad men, really, according to their lights; many of them were what we would call well-meaning men. But the result of their blindness was the crucifixion of the Son of God.

Now this is a fact worth thinking about. For one thing it is a plea for charity in judgment. The real root of the evil men do in the world, to themselves and to one another, is often just blindness. Modern psychology is making this clear to-day. We sin against ourselves and against one another, because we are spiritually only half-awake. Looking back on the things which we have all done in our life and which produced unhappiness, we know now that when we did them we were blind. We were blinded by pride or by passion, which threw a glamour over unworthy things and muffled conscience so that its voice was unintelligible. We knew not what we did. In the case of a drunkard, for instance, Professor James tells us that the thing that fastens his vice upon him is just his way of self-excusing, of throwing dust in his own eyes. If he would really see himself as a drunkard and face the shock, the cold truth would be the beginning of his cure. It would give him the chance to face the light and seek the way of deliverance. The same thing is true of other sins. It is because we do not see our fellows as they are, with all their needs and difficulties, in the sacred value of their own personality, that we do them wrong, or use them for our own pleasure or our own profit. Think of the callousness that permitted men, many of them religious, to work children of six years old in mines or factories a century ago. It staggers us. But the explanation was that they were blinded by what they called 'economic necessity' to the needs and sufferings of these little ones. We are blinded by wrong ideas of patriotism and what is called national honour, and the result is war. We are blinded by ideas of personal dignity and so are led into conflict and bitterness. We are blinded by what we think is our own interest, and there is ruthless competition. We cannot see that there can be no real good for ourselves which is not also concerned with the good of others. We cannot see that outside the will of God there is no peace for us and no real joy or blessedness. And so we seek for things in which there is no profit, and imagine we are doing God service when in reality we are only serving ourselves.

To realize this blindness is a powerful plea for charity. Aggrey of Africa—who became before he died the biggest reconciling force of our time in the racial conflict between black and white—maintained this charity. When he was met with insult, instead of flying into a passion or taking refuge in pride, he used to ask, 'What is making him do it?' 'What lies behind this enmity?' He realized that the man was being blinded, probably carrying in his heart an unresolved conflict which was projected on his opponent; and he tried to get behind and to understand. Is not this the reason why Christ bade us refrain from judging the sinner while we condemn the sin? It is because we often do not understand. There is always something more behind the sin or the wrong than just the desire to do evil. There is something which blinds, and which, if we could understand it, would put us into the only position in which we could help. For there is no way in which we can act rightly toward others, except by trying to understand and to sympathize. It was Christ's own method. 'Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do.'

III.

But is not this also the diagnosis of our real need? It is the need to be awakened to spiritual realities. 'If thou hadst known,' Christ cried, as He wept over Jerusalem, 'if thou hadst known in this thy day the things that belong unto thy peace.' In a sense, Christ was the only man in all history who was fully awake, fully conscious of reality. He was the only man who walked the world with fully open eyes. That is only another way of saying that He alone was fully conscious of God. And because He was open to spiritual values, seeing through the veil of sense the invisible which is the only real, and lived daily in contact with it, He seemed to men only a strange being who was out of touch with life. Mr. H. G. Wells among his earlier stories has one entitled 'The Country of the Blind.' It tells how a man in his travels came into a valley shut away from the rest of the world by precipitous walls, in which all the people were blind. Down these walls he clambered, and lived among the inhabitants. They thought him queer. 'His brain is affected,' said their experts. 'It is affected by these queer things called the eyes which keep it in a constant state of irritation and distraction.' The only remedy they could suggest was an operation to take away his sight; then he would be normal, like the rest of them, and they determined on the operation. He had fallen in love with a sightless maiden, and conscious of the difference between herself and him, she begged him for her sake to consent, and he had nearly agreed. But one morning the sight of the sunrise on the rocks and the meadows beautiful with white narcissus made him feel that 'he and the blind world and the valley and his love and all were no more than a pit of sin.' And under the impulse of this revelation he began to climb out of the valley, out into the great world where all men walked in the light. It is a startling parable of the way in which people thought of Christ, in which some think of Him still, for that matter. The world still tries to put out the eyes of men who have come to see the real and the true amid a mass of illusions and are trying to live by it.

Jesus was fully awake. He lived with open eyes, seeing alone of all men the true world, the world in which goodness and truth and love and all that is of God is the only real; and He came to bring us into it, to open our eyes. 'I am the light of the world. He that followeth me shall not walk in darkness.'

Our real need, first of all, is this unveiling. And this vision of Christ on His Cross has the power finally to shatter our blindness, if only we are sincere enough with it to give it a chance. He knew that, and was content. He had come to see that He was up against a world so obsessed with pride and wrong values, that only love at the flashpoint of sacrifice could break through it. As we think of Him there, two things begin to happen.

We see the real nature of sin—the sin of ordinary life on which we look so leniently because we do not realize its deadly power. We see the pride that often stands between us and one another, and in the light of the Cross how deadly it begins to appear! We see our selfishness and how that may thwart the loving will of God. We see our self-will and that road along which it leads us with such obstinate feet, and how it may come to produce Calvary. For Calvary is not merely an incident in the past: it is the revelation of what is happening now in the world in which we live wherever the loving will of God is thwarted. But the true nature of sin flames out there, like the true nature of some innocent-looking germ in the loathsome and deadly disease which it produces.

But we see also the true nature of life at its best. For to live is to love and to give oneself for others. To see Jesus on the Cross and catch His Spirit there, is to see human life at its best, its highest power. A spirit like that breaking in on our world of twisted human relationships, of waspish minds and irritable tempers, reveals a splendour before which selfishness and pride can never be anything else than blotches on the soul. To see Jesus there in the glory of unconquerable love is to see life in its true quality, beside which the seekers after mere material possession are only children playing with toys.

It is not a very happy moment when the light begins to break and we stand for the first time in the world of moral reality which Christ unveils. It is a difficult world to live in, and we feel unequal to it. But this prayer of Christ has comfort for such an hour of awakening. For it reveals a love at the heart of this new world which can enable us to live in it. The true world which Christ reveals is not a cold and pitiless place of moral demand, but the Father's house in which He takes us by the hand, our Friend and Saviour. That is the fact which was immediately illustrated in the incident that follows this prayer—the first victory of the Cross. As the dying thief watched Christ there, and listened to this prayer, he suddenly became aware of this world of spiritual reality, and felt his powerlessness to live in it, even to find a place in it. But he felt, too, the warmth and hope of that forgiving love. And it awoke a prayer. 'Lord, remember me when thou comest into thy kingdom.' And at once the Hand that had opened the gates of this kingdom, was stretched out with welcome to lead him in.

A Western Gloss in John ii. 3.

By J. Rendel Harris, Litt.D., LL.D., D.D., Birmingham.

We have from time to time been able to detect in the apocryphal legends which constitute so large a part of the *Acta Sanctorum* references to the text of the New Testament which show an affinity with some of the earliest readings, which are grouped comprehensively under the title of 'Western.' Even if the detection of such readings adds little or nothing of value to the crowd of variants which disfigure the pages of our critical editions, we may often get local colour either for the reading or for the author who is being quoted. I came across a curious instance recently which suggested that Alcuin, or an earlier writer whom he was trying to improve, had a text of the Fourth Gospel which was marked by notable Western readings.

In the second chapter of John we have the account of the miracle at Cana of Galilee, and it is said that 'the wine ran short.' Apparently this abrupt statement (ὑστερήσαντος δὲ οἶνου) seemed to some editor or transcriber to be the description of an effect without the indication of the cause. So he added the explanation of the deficiency in the supply of wine, by saying that it was *due to the crowd of guests who had been invited*, and who had, presumably, all accepted the generous invitation and taken advantage of it. It is well known to the textual critics that the reference to the number of guests as the cause of the failure of the wine is in the oldest Latin tradition of the text (which is commonly, but probably in-correctly, described as African). For example, it occurs in the very old MS. which is called the Palatine Gospels, and is marked by the sign *e*, as well as elsewhere. We are not discussing the textual tradition of the whole passage, which is interesting enough: our concern is with the additional words:

> *per (? propter) multam turbam vocitorum (=vocatorum).*

Now let us turn to Alcuin's story of the Life of St. Vedast, who is said to be the first bishop of Arras, and the founder of the famous Abbey of St. Vedast, lying a little to the east of Mons. It is probable that Alcuin is re-editing an earlier text, perhaps from the abbey itself. When he comes to the description of the miracles done by the saint, we are regaled by a veritable banquet of marvels, which may, perhaps, be described as gospel miracles, rechauffés and highly spiced. One special case was a reproduction of what happened at Cana of Galilee. The story was something to the following effect:

A noble and religious person came to visit St. Vedast, and to be refreshed by the honey-sweet of his doctrine. He arrived early and stayed late, so captivated was he by the charm of the saint and of his teaching. Midday passed, and the shadows began to lengthen. It was time for the traveller to depart; so Vedast, unwilling that his guest should leave without bodily refreshment to be superadded to the spiritual, sent his servant to see what wine was left in the jug, and bring a cup to speed the parting guest. The boy returned and whispered to his master that the flagon was empty. The explanation, as recorded by Alcuin, was as follows:

> '*Propter hospitum frequentiam*, et viri Dei largam erga omnes munificentiam, non arida patris caritate, aridum invenit vasculum, in quo vinum servari solebat.'

The vessel was dry, on account of the number of the guests and the largesse of the entertainer. The introduction of the crowd of thirsty guests is abrupt. One would have said that it was a personal and private interview of the noble visitor with the saint. The language is certainly that of the glossator of the Fourth Gospel. Let us see what has happened. The saint, overcome with shame at the small dimension of his wine-cellar, turns to prayer, reminding the Lord that he had brought water out of the rock to supply the need of the thirsty Israelites, and *at Cana had produced wine of matchless flavour*:

> 'et in Cana Galileæ aquam in mirabilis vini convertit saporem.'

Then Vedast sent his boy back to draw from the empty vessel what Divine Grace had filled it with. The servant came running back to say that the wine was overflowing, *the very best wine*, too. So the saint made glad thanksgiving and supplied the need of the visitor and of the guests, his companions.

What was this text? The problem becomes increasingly interesting, when we notice that the Vedast text has points of contact not only with the Palatine Gospel, but also with the Commentary of Ephrem Syrus upon the Gospel.

First of all, Ephrem knew about the superfluity of the invited guests: he quotes the Gospel in the form:

> 'Every man at the first *sets forth* good wine, after that light wine.'

and then comments on it as follows:

> 'His wealth did not scorn the poverty of those who could not even *set forth light* wine to match the number of the invited guests (*juxta invitatorum numerum*)' Ephr. (ed. Mös. p. 55).

From the sequence of the argument it seems proper to infer that Ephrem had in his text the same reference that we find in the Vedast story and in the Old Latin MSS (*e* and *l*).

Next we notice that the quality of the miraculous vintage is expressed in similar terms in Vedast and in Ephrem. In the former we are told that the saint prays confidently to Him who *at Cana of Galilee* turned water into wine of matchless flavour (*aquam in mirabilis vini convertit saporem*); with the result that his servant came back to report that the wine-jar was running over with the very best wine. When we turn to Ephrem we find that the wine of the miracle was of such delicacy as to surpass in flavour all other wines (*saporis suavitate omnia vini genera superabat*). He calls it regularly *suave, suavissimum.* This might be only an attempt to express the 'best wine' of the Gospel; but there is more involved than a transplanted adjective. Ephrem goes on to comment on it as upon a continuous Biblical text. 'In the last days,' says he, 'the one who changed water into delicate wine, is able to restore to *all* created things *a flavour of ineffable sweetness*' ('saporem, cujus dulcedo ineffabilis est'). This implies that Ephrem had in his text a reference in some detail to the quality of the 'best' wine; and this is very nearly the description that we had in Vedast. From which we infer that both writers, Ephrem and Alcuin, had before them a glossed text, in which stress was laid (1) on the number of the guests; (2) on the quality of the miraculous vintage. To what author shall we ascribe the supposed glosses? Is it Tatian again? There does not seem to be any trace of the expansions in the Netherlands Harmony. That, however, does not constitute a final disproof of Tatianic origin.

◆

Literature.

THE SON OF MAN.

This really characteristic title, which occurs some eighty times in the Gospels, has been a constant subject of discussion among scholars. On the ground that Jesus spoke in Aramaic there has been an increasing tendency, during the last twenty years or more, to lay stress on the Aramaic original of the phrase. In the Aramaic equivalent *bar nāsh* (*ā*), the force of 'the son' had been so weakened by time that the whole expression practically meant nothing more than *man* (*homo, Mensch*—not *vir*), and as Jesus described Himself by this title, what meaning could He have intended to convey by it? Twenty years ago Schweitzer, in surveying the course of the discussion, declared that the problem had been solved, but succeeding scholars have differed from him. The problem has now been taken up anew in *Anthropos and Son of Man*, 'a Study in the Religious Syncretism of the Hellenistic Orient,' by Carl H. Kraeling, Ph.D., Instructor at the Lutheran Theological Seminary at Philadelphia (Milford; 10s. 6d. net). Dr. Kraeling has set himself to discover the ultimate origin of the title. In his view it goes back beyond its Aramaic usage, or even its occurrence in Ezekiel and in the vision in Dn 7. From his researches, which have taken him far afield, into Mandean and Manichean religious thought, and into Hellenistic and Gnostic systems, he concludes that the Jewish-Christian 'Son of Man' is but one manifestation of a ubiquitous Oriental figure known in certain syncretistic circles as 'the Anthropos.' Basing his views upon those of Professor R. Reitzenstein of Göttingen, he traces the expression back to the ancient Iranian *gayamaretan*, 'mortal life,' a mythical person originally devoid of a proper name. This Gayomart became known to the people of Mesopotamia probably in pre-Parthian days. By reason of his place in the primordial conflict, he was identified with Marduk and thus transformed into a man-like deity and primordial champion. In this capacity he was received into Judaism in the second pre-Christian century and furnished the inspiration for the 'man-like one' of Daniel and for the Messianic interpretation which the figure received in the Book of Enoch. The idea developed that the Anthropos was to reappear for the salvation of the soul in the guise of a Divine Saviour, and hence we have first the Adamites, then Christ, and finally Buddha, Zarathusthra, and Mani. By adopting the title, Jesus gave expression to the conviction that He was the human messenger in whom the Heavenly Man manifested Himself to save the world. It is doubtful whether these views will be accepted by Biblical scholars, even the most critical. After all, there is little resemblance between the Anthropos to which the author goes back and Jesus' use of the name 'Son of Man.' The former, as admitted, is not a figure of determinative importance, but merely a type of primordial champion and the father-creator of the human race, although Dr. Kraeling holds that elements connecting him with human nature and its redemption became added later on. Jesus' use of the name, on the other hand, seems to be definitely connected with His Ideal Manhood, His Frail Manhood, or His Prophetic Office, and in these aspects it does not appear to have any bearing on Marduk or any other being of anthropogenetic and heroic activities, even though allowances be made for a Judaistic medium. Moreover, we must not overlook the fact that, though Jesus as a rule spoke in Aramaic, it is quite possible that He may sometimes have spoken in Greek, in which case ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου may have been the expression used. The book has been prepared with great thoroughness and with a full knowledge of the literature on the subject; and the author's hypothesis, though it may not contain the solution of the Son of Man problem, cannot fail to stimulate new lines of thought in connexion with it. The book deserves the consideration of every New Testament student.

GREAT MEN AND MOVEMENTS IN ISRAEL.

To Professor Rudolf Kittel, who has done so much for the interpretation of the history and the religion of Israel, has occurred the happy idea of writing that history round the great personalities of Israel. Each chapter of his *Great Men and Movements in Israel* (Williams & Norgate; 15s. net) deals with one or more of the great figures who profoundly affected the political life, the religious thinking, or the literary record of Israel; and, while many of the chapters are devoted to personalities of epoch-making importance, such as Moses, David, Elijah, Jeremiah, Ezra, Nehemiah, Judas the Maccabee, some—and these not the least fascinating—deal with personalities no less important, but whose names we do not know, such as the great narrators familiar to us as the Elohist and more particularly the Yahwist, for whom Kittel has the highest admiration, and the profound and skilful writer to whom we owe the incomparable sketch of the fortunes of David in 2 S 9–20. The Deuteronomic reform is treated with an intimate appreciation of the political as well as the religious forces at work, and in a way which shows that Kittel has not been uninfluenced by the criticism which in the last few years has been so abundantly bestowed upon the Book of Deuteronomy.

All the biographical sketches, which, taken together, constitute a consecutive presentation of the history of Israel covering a thousand years, display not only, as we should expect, a thoroughly sifted appreciation of the recorded facts, but a genuine penetration into the motives of the principal actors. The estimates of character are often refreshingly unconventional. Both Ezra and Nehemiah, for example, we are told, were 'masters of political intrigue.' 'Neither was a really great man; neither was a real genius, nor had unusual greatness of soul or great religious zeal.' Again, the Servant in the 'Servant-songs' of Deutero-Isaiah is held to be not only an individual, but a personal friend of Deutero-Isaiah, who died a martyr's death at the hands of the Babylonian government—an estimate with which assuredly not every one will agree. But the treatment of every problem and character is stimulating and provocative in the best sense of the word.

The translation, which, generally speaking, is skilfully done, and practically never carries with it any reminiscence of the idiom of its German original, is curiously marred by some extraordinary blemishes, a few at least of which go to show that a translator must be familiar with the subject-matter, as well as with the language of the book he translates. Only thus can be explained the amusing reference on p. 325 to *Count* Wellhausen's theory (instead of the *Graf*-Wellhausen theory), or the equally amusing reference on p. 210 to 'the descendants of the seven hundred and twenty-two who had remained in the country' after the fall of Samaria (instead of 'those who had remained behind in 722,' *i.e.* B.C.). Dreadful and indeed inexcusable havoc is wrought upon scores of proper names which are, in the most unaccountable way, erroneously reproduced. Nadab, for example, appears as Nabad, Hazor as Hagor, Jehoash as Jeoash, Tammuz as Tamiz, Sumerian as Sumarian, Duhm as Duhn, de Wette as de Witt, Xenophanes as Xenophon, and so on. It is a great pity that so careful a scholar as Kittel should be so misrepresented by his translators, who otherwise have done their work with care and skill.

ORTHODOXY.

A veritable feast of good things, at which tastes of the most diverse kind may be satisfied, is furnished by the Rev. E. H. Archer-Shepherd's *Orthodox Religion in the Light of To-day* (Rivingtons). The wide range of the discussion is suggested by the sub-title, 'Studies in Evolution, The Higher Criticism, Apologetics, Christology, and Other Subjects.' The work is the ripe fruitage of much meditation in many fields, and the writer has been careful to acquaint himself so thoroughly with the facts both of the Physical Sciences and of Biblical Criticism that his words cannot fail to carry real weight with Christian men who respect orthodoxy and who yet share with conviction the intellectual inheritance of their own day.

Mr. Archer-Shepherd is fully persuaded of the truth of evolution, and yet equally persuaded that it does not destroy the Christian doctrine of the Fall, though he thinks that in this connexion 'Paradise Lost' has probably done more harm to Christianity than anything ever written in the name of science. The writer is at once orthodox and modern: he does not hesitate to say that Biblical chronology is often hopelessly at fault, and that the frank acceptance of the critical view of the Old Testament 'might gain many a recruit for the ministry, and also might save many a one from making shipwreck of his faith.' But he has a clear eye for all that is essentially Christian; and the Incarnation and the Resurrection are to him of very special importance; these things 'as miracles stand upon a different plane from the supernatural occurrences which are said to have attended them.' But while some of the 'miracles' in the Old Testament may just be poetry, some of the recorded miracles of our Lord cannot, he believes, be accounted for on a naturalistic hypothesis. 'If He was really a supernatural person, it is not difficult to believe that His presence would be accompanied by supernatural occurrences.' Particularly refreshing are his outspoken words on the Real Presence. 'If,' he says, 'a duly qualified minister of Christ, by duly pronouncing with right intention the words of institution, could cause bread and wine to become really in themselves Christ's Body and Blood, then there would be a sudden change in the elements . . . and this would happen not once, nor twice, but as often as a Consecration took place; and God would be working in a manner contrary to the greatest of His own general laws . . . whereas God ever works slowly and gradually, by a process of becoming, through growth and decay.' Mr. Archer-Shepherd is equally at home in discussing the Mystery of Pain, the Nature of Inspiration, the Virgin Birth, and the Date of the Pentateuch, and he has profound and pertinent things to say about them all. If, as he says, 'there are many in Christendom who are in the Stone Age of religion,' that will certainly not be the fault of Mr. Archer-Shepherd.

THE HISTORICAL BACKGROUND OF EARLY CHRISTIANITY.

Professor S. Angus of the University of Sydney has been for years a diligent student of the environment of early Christianity. He has already published two studies in this field, and now comes his most important contribution to it, *The Religious Quests of the Græco-Roman World* (Murray; 15s. net). In this work the attempt is made not only to interpret the Græco-Roman period (from Alexander the Great to Constantine), but also to include many citations and references from ancient records. And we may say without exaggeration that the work is a monument of industrious and painstaking scholarship.

As for its contents, it begins with a sketch of the religious outlook of the Græco-Roman age, which is represented as a serious, brooding, emotional, even sentimental age, but not an age of darkness and despair. Its dominant conceptions of salvation are described, as also its chief 'religious refuges' (Judaism, Greek moral and mystical philosophy, the mystery-religions, and Christianity). The unhappy record of the relations of Christianity to the ancient culture is also considered in this first section: 'Christianity acted in much the same way to its old home as Israel did to Egypt, from which it brought the cult of the golden calves but left the doctrine of immortality.'

The second section deals chiefly with the development within Christianity of magical and sacramentarian beliefs and practices. 'In the first centuries magic secured such a hold in ecclesiastical Christianity as was not relaxed for centuries; it lingers still in theological niches, where its presence is concealed by a refusal to ask questions.' 'The sacraments have not yet recovered from their implication in the barbarisation of Europe on the passing of classical culture.' The relation of St. Paul and the Fourth Gospel to sacramentarianism is here discussed; it is maintained that the Fourth Gospel, more than any New Testament writing, has promoted the sacramentarian cause.

The third section treats informatively of astralism, of which little is said in the ordinary text-books, although it was, in Boll's words, 'the scientific theology of waning heathenism'; and the fourth section of the Hermetic religion, of whose influence upon Christianity we are beginning to hear a good deal, although, as Scott says, there is no trace in *Hermetica* of a Saviour in the Christian sense.

The final sections consider the relations in the Græco-Roman era between Gnosticism and Christianity, and between Religion and Healing. This last is also a subject of present-day interest, and the chapter on it might well have been extended; and it looks as though Dr. Angus would gladly have pursued the discussion further.

Which leads us to offer two general, but minor, criticisms. The first is that the book comes too abruptly to a close, and the second that the author is sometimes too insistent upon his theological point of view; after all, it is primarily an historical work.

THE TITTLED BIBLE.

Hitherto little has been known of the meaning and use of the Hebrew Tittles or Taggin. These consist of little strokes over, under, or at the side of some of the letters, mostly in the Scrolls. In many cases they assume the form of curves or ringlets above the letters and twists inside them.

They have been constantly regarded by sages and rabbis as of equal Divine origin with the Law itself, though to the ordinary reader they seem to be mere ornaments with no object or purpose. Our main knowledge of them so far has been derived from Talmudic and Rabbinic literature, and especially from two outstanding documents, namely, the Sefer Taggin, which was incorporated into the Mahazor Vitry of the twelfth century, and the Kiryat Sefer of Meïri. These were manuals or guides to direct the Scribes when and how to place the Tittles. In *The Tittled Bible: A Model Codex of the Pentateuch* (Maggs Bros.; £25), by the Very Rev. Dr. Moses Gaster, late Chief Rabbi of the Sephardic Communities, we have now a thoroughly competent dissertation on the history of the Tittles, their origin, date, and significance, with four hundred and eighty-nine collotype facsimile plates of a Model Codex of date about A.D. 1350, discovered by him in Central Asia and now forming No. 85 of the Gaster Collection in the British Museum. The learned Rabbi, in an interesting critical introduction, has used his vast Hebrew knowledge to determine as far as possible the meaning of these Tittles and other signs. They were not merely ornamental strokes, but carried with them some deeper meaning, Midrashic, allegorical, or symbolical. Modern science is now turning, as he tells us, to minute things, and in the atom a whole solar system has been revealed. So it may happen that by the discovery of this manuscript, with its numerous Tittles, which Dr. Gaster believes to be the only Model Codex (*i.e.* used by Scribes as a model for copying) that has been preserved so far, some of the old problems connected with Hebrew tradition and writing may be brought nearer to solution. Among other things, Dr. Gaster discusses the difference between the Pentateuch in its book form (*i.e.* the so-called Masoretic text) and the Scroll with its special characteristics. He seeks to place the Scroll for the first time in its proper perspective, claiming for it the higher antiquity. He surveys anew, from a different point of view, the activity of the Soferim or Scribes of old, of which very little is known. He brings within the compass of his investigation the connexion between the Written Law and the Oral Tradition, as well as the beginnings of the Masora and the origin of the Biblical accents. He traces the history of the Tittles from the Talmud down to the sixteenth century, and gives in full all the texts from Maimonides onwards both in Hebrew and in English translation. At the close of the introduction he indicates a way for the classification and dating of Scrolls of which no one has hitherto thought, and thus points to the possibility of constructing an Archetype of the Pentateuch. He has been studying all such questions, he informs us, for forty years, and collecting materials on them, and he has certainly given us a unique and valuable work which will largely serve towards the elucidation of many problems connected with Biblical traditions and their development. It is clear that, unless great antiquity and importance had been attached to the Tittles, they would never have been allowed to be introduced into the Sacred Scrolls, which were regarded as absolutely inviolable. The plates are beautifully done, and the volume is indispensable to all Biblical scholars who are interested in this new and promising field of investigation.

DR. GLOVER ON THE INFLUENCE OF CHRIST.

What is it that gives such fascination to anything Dr. Glover writes? Whatever he writes about, he is always 'as interesting as a novel.' Perhaps it is his allusiveness. He knows so much of out-of-the-way literature that the knowledge is always escaping to illuminate some point or other. A full mind that wears its learning lightly and never bludgeons the reader with heavy facts is a delightful companion in a book. And then Dr. Glover has a gift for phrases that sum up a situation or a personality, and linger in the mind. Here are some from his latest book, *The Influence of Christ in the Ancient World* (Cambridge University Press; 5s. net): 'If you look back over the centuries, the Christian religion stabilises society without sterilising it'; about the apocalyptist, 'when it comes to moral issues he must jog the elbow of God and try to hurry Him'; of the Jew and his inability to keep the Law, 'he made shift with doing his best (a phrase that a man never uses of himself except to surrender with).'

The thesis of this charming, thoughtful, and informing book is that Jesus came to the world as a liberating force, at once in virtue of the factors He was to teach men to recognize and of the personality He was. The book gives us under five heads, 'Society,' 'Thought,' 'Character,' 'Life or Death?' and 'God,' first a picture of the ancient world, and then a picture of what Christ did for it. There are probably few living men better able to show us the world of Christ's day (and before His day); and here we see it as it was, its loss of nerve, its gropings, its habits of thought, its philosophies, and over against this the Liberator who came 'not to destroy but to develop,' who asked so much of man and gave the power to achieve. Christ did much to bring hope to the world, but not by the story of His life or the preaching of His followers. He helped the world most, and the faith spread, by the power and peace men saw in Christians. So Dr. Glover shows us in one of the most moving passages in his book, a book which it has been a joy to read and to praise.

MOULTON'S GRAMMAR.

At last, with the publication of Part iii., the second volume of Moulton's *Grammar of New Testament Greek* (T. & T. Clark) is brought to a close. Part i. ('Sounds and Writing') appeared in 1919 under the editorship of Mr. Wilbert Francis Howard, M.A., B.D., and Part ii. ('Accidence') in 1921. Before his death Dr. Moulton had finished the MS. of Parts i. and ii., and had written the important chapter upon Word-Composition for Part iii. The editor has supplemented this with a chapter on Word-Formation by Suffixes. In writing this chapter he has been indebted in particular to the work in this field of the late Karl Brugmann and Professor Albert Debrunner.

It had been Moulton's intention to furnish his Grammar with an Appendix on Semitisms in the New Testament. This the editor has also supplied, and he has been able to do so in full view of the recent challenge in the works of Torrey, Charles, and Burney of the accepted theory regarding the original language in which the Acts, the Apocalypse, and the Fourth Gospel were written. With the help also of an unpublished thesis by Dr. R. M'Kinlay he has shown instances where an alleged Semitism is an established construction in Mediæval or Modern Greek.

There is an Index to Quotations, an Index of Words and Forms, and an Index of Subjects, all of which have been prepared with great care and represent a vast amount of labour. Indeed, the labour has been so great that Mr. Howard's name is rightly associated with Moulton's on the title-page, and we hope that the great work, so creditable to English scholarship, will be completed before long with the publication of a third volume on Syntax. We should add that the cost of volume II. part iii. is 12s. net.

THE LEGEND OF HELL.

In a flame-coloured volume, embellished with some realistic illustrations, the Rev. Percy Dearmer, D.D., discourses learnedly and vigorously on *The Legend of Hell* (Cassell; 7s. 6d. net). He does not think that the doctrine of hell, using the word in its plain meaning as a place of everlasting punishment, requires refutation among educated people of to-day, but the taint of it still hangs in the air, and prejudices large sections of people against Christianity. Accordingly, he would do something towards clearing away the taint and removing the prejudice. But his chief motive in writing his book is to show that the charge of having fathered such a doctrine can no longer be brought against Jesus. 'Like the breaking through of the sun after a storm has been the change made in the Legend of Hell by the advance of New Testament scholarship.'

The doctrine of everlasting punishment—in its ordinary, traditional acceptation—is certainly inconsistent with Jesus' general teaching about the Love of God, as it is clearly revolting to the modern conscience, so that, as the late Dean Rashdall has said, we could not accept it in deference to any external authority whatever. It is therefore fortunate for the Church that it has never committed itself, as a whole at any rate, to this 'monstrous legend.'

Origin does not necessarily prejudice validity, but it is at least interesting to learn that hell originated among a downtrodden people, crying for vengeance upon their enemies. It was not derived from the Old Testament, but probably from Zoroastrianism, with which the Jews had come in contact in their exile. And it originated in Judaism, says Dr. Charles, when 'a handful of the pious could not only comfortably believe that God was the God of the Jew alone, and only of a very few of these, but also could imagine that part of their highest bliss in the next world would consist in witnessing the torment of the damned.' It is strange and sad to reflect that this last thought, though repudiated by a more generous Judaism, received permanent expression in Christian theology in the *Summa* of St. Thomas Aquinas.

TWO GOOD BOOKS ON THE GOSPELS.

Canon Anthony C. Deane has already interested and edified the religious public by his previous books on 'How to Enjoy the Bible' and on the Life of Jesus Christ. His most recent essay is, we think, even better: *How to Understand the Gospels* (Hodder & Stoughton; 2s. 6d. net). It would be difficult to find a better popular guide to answer such questions as these: when were the Gospels written? by whom? are they trustworthy? how were they made? The author is up to date in his knowledge. He is reasonably orthodox; for example, he offers a good defence of the Virgin Birth. He writes easily and engagingly. And, though he avoids, rightly, too much detail, he offers all the information that an intelligent inquirer could ask. There are ten chapters, of which two are devoted to the 'birth' and the 'sources' of the Gospels, and two each to the four Gospels. As evidence of his competence it may be mentioned that he balances the traditional two-document theory of the sources, Mark and Q, against Streeter's four-document hypothesis, and apparently leans towards the latter. But apart from details, this is a thoroughly sound and scholarly book, which will readily appeal to the lay mind and satisfy its thirst for relevant knowledge.

The other book is equally good in its own way, and its way is perhaps a little higher up. Any one who has worked through Canon A. W. F. Blunt's book on the Acts of the Apostles in the Clarendon Bible will be eager to possess his new work on *The Gospel according to Saint Mark* (Milford; 4s. 6d. net). The Commentary on Acts is probably the best short commentary on that book in English and confers distinction on an excellent series. A sound judgment on the Mark book could only be given after a similar detailed use. But after reading the introduction, and testing the commentary, it may be permitted to express the opinion that this latter work is not only on the same admirable lines as the former, but that it will be found to be on as high a level. It is a little disappointing to find Peter's share in Mark rather minimized, but on the whole Peter is credited with a substantial amount. The complicated problems concerning (1) the sources of Mark, and (2) its relation to other Gospels and to Paul, are handled with remarkable lucidity. And the running commentary on the text, which lifts important points into the light and never allows us to lose the wood in the trees, is just what we want. It may be added that there are numerous illustrations, a good map, and a plan of Jerusalem at all its stages. The printing and binding are all we should expect from such publishers.

CHRISTIAN ETHICS.

The hottest and most interesting place upon the field these days is where the onslaught upon Christian ethics is being pressed home with a kind of ferocious energy. That being so, all sound books on the Christian side are to be given a hearty welcome. Here is another from Dr. F. A. M. Spencer, an old soldier in these wars. *The Theory of Christ's Ethics* (Allen & Unwin; 10s. 6d. net) is an interesting and a thought-provoking, if somewhat uneven, book. No doubt, as at Pentecost, every new generation must hear Christ's message in its own mental language, or else that will, at best, be blown to it faintly as from an alien world. Yet the chapter on the Moralizing of Instincts, in which our author painstakingly translated Christ's teaching into terms of the new psychology, with much talk about complexes and sublimation and the like, leaves it for some of us a great deal less impressive than in its original form. This is a book of a wide range. Its chapter headings form an appetizing menu. And if, once or twice, the fare might have been ampler, usually one is sent upon his way well fed and deftly served.

The Beckley Social Service Lecture has been fortunate in its lecturers, and Dr. W. B. Selbie is, of course, well up to standard. His is a living and a lively mind, that arrests the attention and stings the drowsiest of us broad awake. And in *The Christian Ethic* (Epworth Press; 2s. 6d. net) there are all his usual characteristics. It is merely a booklet of less than a hundred pages. An introduction on the old, old theme of Religion and Morality, and then a plunge into the Christian Ethic and the Individual, the Family, and the State; and so, too soon an end. Yet he touches on many themes —war, education, the ministry of women, birth control, Church and State, authority and freedom, and the like. But, eager though he is in every kind of social energy and service, always it is the winning and ennobling of the individual that is the real and final hope. Dr. Selbie knows his own mind through and through, and throws down his views with confidence in a challenging fashion that compels his reader to keep turning over his own ideas and opinions. Yet he is well aware that to accept ideals in all honesty is one thing, and to see how to live them out another and much harder. 'Christians generally have a rather pathetic confidence in the application of Christian principles as a universal panacea for human ills,' he says, 'but it will not come within the range of practical politics till they are able to answer such questions as how, where, when, and by whom.' This is a rousing little book, but it does not give us very definite answers to these questions; and indeed could hardly do so. For, as he himself admits gratefully, Christ's principles are principles, and not rules.

KANT'S VIEW OF GOD.

A piece of admirable criticism and construction lies before us in *Kant's Conception of God*, by F. E. England, M.A., Ph.D. (Allen & Unwin; 10s. 6d. net). The author aims at showing that Kant's negative conclusions in the metaphysical concept of God do not necessarily follow from the critical principle. Kant, he holds, never quite escaped from the view of the universe characteristic of Leibniz. 'In the critical doctrine as a whole,' there is implied 'the conception of a necessary ground of the world of experience.' The mechanism of Nature must be grounded in a supreme intelligence. The facts of the moral life, especially moral obligation, imply a supreme moral Personality.

In an appendix we have Kant's 'Nova Dilucidatio' for the first time in English. That alone is valuable, but the whole treatise will amply repay study.

Characters and Events, by Mr. John Dewey (Allen & Unwin; 2 vols., 21s. net), contains practically a complete collection of the published articles and essays of this distinguished American psychologist. There are something over a hundred in all. Volume one contains essays on literary subjects, together with articles on events and movements in the Far East. Volume two deals with American thought and life during the War and the years following the War. Inevitably there is much in these essays that appears strangely belated and out of date. The writer himself remarks in one place, 'In the presence of accomplished events, what I wrote a few weeks ago is strangely remote and pallid.' In China especially, where events have been moving with such abnormal swiftness and changes have been so kaleidoscopic, it seems hardly worth while to republish reflections and speculations of ten years ago. This criticism, however, does not apply in the same degree to the American essays, for there we have the interest of watching the procession of events and the fluctuations of feeling through the war years as interpreted by one of the most vigorous and penetrating minds in the country. From this point of view a careful study of these essays would do much to throw light on American mentality and America's attitude to the League of Nations. It need hardly be said that Mr. Dewey, whatever subject he touches on, has always something worth saying, and these essays have not only many gems of thought scattered through them, but they are the expression of a consistent philosophy expounded with a rare breadth of view and with a great wealth of applications in the fields of moral and social life, of national and international relations.

The Rev. Frank Ballard, D.D., has long been acknowledged as a powerful Christian apologist. In *True Catholicism from the Christian Standpoint* (Epworth Press; 1s. net), he takes up his pen in defence of Protestantism. He has decided opinions and the power of expressing them with vigour. He utters a wholesome protest against the surrender to the Church of Rome of the term 'Catholic.' His exposure of the claims of Rome and of the Anglo-Catholics is trenchant, and none the less weighty that it keeps within the bounds of Christian charity.

The After-World of the Poets, by the Rev. Leslie D. Weatherhead, M.A. (Epworth Press; 5s. net), is an exceedingly able and scholarly study of the contribution of the Victorian poets to the development of the idea of immortality. The poets studied are Wordsworth and Shelley, who mark the discarding of orthodox ideas of immortality; Tennyson, from whom comes 'a new projection of Christian thought born of the fear of death'; Arnold, Clough, and Swinburne, who illustrate the contribution of doubt; and finally Browning, with whom we reach 'the climax of development.' A careful analysis is given in each case of the passages relevant to the subject. An introductory essay deals with 'the validity of the poet's contribution to ideas,' and here, perhaps, the writer overstrains the contrast between poetic vision and the more ordinary processes of the mind. The work is of high merit, and will repay the student both of poetry and of religion.

The Hope of the World is the title of a volume of less than a hundred and fifty pages, containing a series of twelve sermons, by the Rev. R. E. Roberts, M.A., Canon Precentor of Leicester and Rector of Ashwell (Wells Gardner; 3s. 6d. net). These sermons are simple in structure, but they contain suggestive thoughts expressed in arresting phrases. 'It may be worth while for our leaders,' he writes, 'to consider whether the task that calls for increased attention at present is not purely evangelistic work in their respective localities.' In support of his message he quotes the words of the Archbishop's Committee's Report on Evangelistic Work. 'If we could focus all the Christian forces in Great Britain upon getting a saint in every factory in the land, and then put a saint in each room of every factory and shop, we should see a great turning to God before three years were out.'

Lectures on preaching tend to become somewhat wearisome, even to the budding preacher. After all, there are not so many secrets to be shared, and we have had Dale and Stalker and many other great preachers disclosing *their* secrets. So that the lesser men are rather forestalled. Some years ago a Mr. Warrack founded a lectureship on preaching in the Scottish Colleges, and we have had Dr. Gossip, Dr. Black, and Dr. Coffin already on this theme. That would seem to be sufficient. But when we take up the latest Warrack lecture, *Preaching Week by Week*, by the Rev. A. Boyd Scott, M.C., D.D. (Hodder & Stoughton; 6s. net), we do actually find an apologia for the book that holds water. None of the previous lecturers has gone on Dr. Boyd Scott's lines, which are briefly as follows: He divides the year by its various religious seasons, Christmas, Easter, and Whitsuntide. Preaching should lead up to these festivals, and also away from them, preparing for them and carrying down their lessons in applications to life. And so the year is filled up, and no preacher need look round for a theme. To carry this idea out a full lectionary is given for every Sunday in the year. In fact, three years of this are given, and also a place for Harvest and New Year, Armistice Day, Children's Day, and Holy Communion. It is plain that great advantages lie in this plan, and these are carefully and fully discussed, along with other matters like the use of the evening service. In spite of our introductory remarks, we add that the young preacher will receive real help and guidance from these ripe and suggestive pages.

In *Human Nature and Human Survival*, by Mr. Thiselton Mark, D.Lit. (Kingsgate Press; 2s. 6d. net), the writer considers in a brief and popular way the question of man's continuing life from the standpoint of the human sciences, especially of psychology and morals. His argument is built upon the affinity of the soul to the ultimate Reality, its perception of that Reality, and those evidences which go to show that 'the underlying purpose of all things is being fulfilled in man, as well as, in part, by him.' These are considerations which may be found valuable aids to faith, though they might not in themselves have power to create and sustain it. The subject is here treated with admirable lucidity and reverence.

The headmaster of Eton, Dr. Cyril Alington, not long ago published one of the best short books of apologetics we have yet seen, and it was warmly praised in this magazine. He has followed this up by a more informal treatment of the same questions in *Doubts and Difficulties* (Longmans; 5s. net; also in paper covers, 3s. 6d. net). The author is supposed to be staying with a friend, a scientist of decided sceptical tendency. They golf, walk, and motor together, throw books at each other and address one another as 'silly ass!' In this atmosphere the discussion is free of formality, and the points made are made in answer to real difficulties. But the marrow of the book is to be found in the letters addressed to his friend's wife in answer to her questions. These deal with all the questions which an intelligent, rather perplexed, woman of to-day would ask—about the claims of Christ, the Church, the Future, and so on. The exposition is clear, persuasive, reasonable, and broad-minded. Indeed, our only criticism is that Dr. Alington gives too much away to 'the enemy.' This point is made by the Archbishop of York in a Foreword, and it is a sound one. But the book on the whole is excellent. We can say of it what we said of its predecessor, that it is the kind of book to put into the hands of any inquiring and perplexed youth.

Christian Religious Experience (Longmans; cloth, 4s. net; paper covers, 2s. 6d. net), by the Right Rev. Arthur Chandler, D.D., is the first of a new series called 'The Anglican Library of Faith and Thought.' The publication of such a series was suggested by the Literature Committee of the English Church Union. The treatment of the subjects is intended to be positive and expository, not polemical or controversial, and to be suitable for readers of general education desirous of thinking clearly and seriously about the fundamental concerns of religion.

In the first part of the work before us, which is thoughtfully and vigorously written, Dr. Chandler discusses the question of the validity or objective truth of Christian experience ('religious' appears to be a superfluous term in the title), as also the factors which go to form Christian experience.

The second part is occupied with the different forms which Christian experience takes (Aspiration, Discipline, Fellowship), and the different phases through which it passes.

Defining Christian experience as 'the awareness of a relationship of the soul to God,' Dr. Chandler combats the view that Christian experience is prior to, and independent of, intellectual faith. This is to join with the new psychology and with modernism in exaggerating the subjective side of religion. Belief prompts and objectifies experience, and experience in its turn vitalizes belief. 'Without experience, belief would be sterile dogma; without belief, experience would be a body of private wishes and ego-centric ideas.'

There are few men of to-day with a better title to write with intimate knowledge on *The Adventure of Youth* (Longmans; 4s. net) than Sir Arthur K. Yapp, K.B.E., Deputy-President of the Y.M.C.A. He has had forty years' experience in association with that organization of world-wide ramifications, and latterly has seen its work in all parts of the world. This has brought him into touch with young men in every walk of life beset with temptations and confronted with the difficulties of choosing a career and of qualifying themselves for their future. He tells them he is an optimist where youth is concerned. At the same time he warns them that there is no easy road to success. Merit has a way of finding the road to the top, but it is the way of hard work and sustained effort. They are not to make money the be-all and end-all of life. An infinitely greater thing is character, and the two don't always go together. Sir Arthur Yapp's advice in many forms is both worldly and other-worldly, and always suggestive and eminently helpful. It is the outstanding privilege of the Y.M.C.A. that it has the moulding of so many of the youth of the country and its merit that it stamps its influence upon so many. No young man can read this book without gaining a good deal of its hopeful and helpful stimulus. If youth only knew, he writes, the adventure of adventures is to be found in the service of Jesus and of His Church. During the last two or three years he has noticed a distinct growth of religious feeling among young men, and he thinks the chief problem before the Churches is in finding men with the necessary personality. But is he justified in saying that our Dick Sheppards and Woodbine Willies are few and far between?

We learn that nearly fifty thousand copies of 'Hudson Taylor in Early Years' and 'Hudson Taylor and the China Inland Mission' have been sold since their publication in 1911 and 1918, a striking testimony to the extraordinary impression made upon the religious world by the life story of this most notable man and Christian missionary. It has now been deemed desirable to issue a shorter life in a single volume under the title *Hudson Taylor: The Man who believed God.* It had been hoped that Dr. and Mrs. Howard Taylor, the authors of the larger volumes, would have undertaken this shorter record, but this was not possible. It has been prepared by another relative, Mr. Marshall Broomhall, M.A., and Dr. Howard Taylor has read the whole of the MS., and it is published for the China Inland Mission by the Religious Tract Society at the popular price of half a crown. Mr. Broomhall is to be congratulated on the skill with which he has done his work. He has written of Hudson Taylor as a hero worshipper. He could not have done otherwise. The heroes and the heroines of the mission field have been many and great-hearted, and Hudson Taylor was one of the greatest. 'And the secret of it all was Hudson Taylor's simple, childlike, unshakable faith in God.'

Born in Barnsley, in the colliery and iron country of South Yorkshire, of Methodist ancestry, he was reared in a Christian home. At the age of nineteen he had an overwhelming assurance of a Divine vocation. 'It was as though he heard the voice of God Himself saying to his inmost soul, "Then go for Me to China!"' This was the conviction and the inspiration of his life. What could have seemed a more hopeless quest than that a young man just come of age should go out to China to undertake the evangelization of that huge territory with its teeming population? But young Hudson Taylor landed in Shanghai, an absolute stranger in a strange land, as the appointed missionary of the Chinese Evangelization Society, which was not too generous in its supply of funds for so big a task. Many times in his life Hudson Taylor was reduced to the last penny, but always he found the money forthcoming just when he was in the direst straits. It is unnecessary to repeat the story of the young missionary and his younger wife who could rejoice with joy unspeakable over one convert, and over three converts, and who were destined later to lay the foundations of the China Inland Mission which was to establish Protestant schools and missions in every one of the vast provinces of the Chinese Empire. He summed up his faith and the basis of the mission in these few words: 'There is a living God who has spoken in the Bible. He means what He says and will do all He has promised.' To him the Bible and New Testament was the 'Book of Certainties.' He suffered incredible privation, frequent and severe attacks of illness, the bereavement of wife and children, but nothing could shake his faith in the absolute certainty of Divine things. How marvellously this faith was justified by results is made abundantly clear in this admirable volume. Where the larger volumes are not to be found this ought to have a place in every minister's library and to be well thumbed from cover to cover.

The Boxer rebellion cost the China Inland Mission many valuable lives, yet thanks to Hudson Taylor's energy it weathered that storm. Now that the revolution of recent years has again affected the whole country it is impossible to foresee what its effect on the work of Christian missions will ultimately be.

A pleasant little book has been written by Dr. F. R. M. Hitchcock on *Christ's Answers to our Questions* (R.T.S.; 1s. 6d. net). The questions are: What can I know? What shall I do? and What may I hope? The answers occupy half the book; the other half deals with chapters on 'In Christ,' 'For Christ,' and 'To Christ.' There is nothing very striking or original in the book. But it is earnest and edifying, and will help and reassure those who do not ask anything strenuous in their reading.

The period of four centuries lying between Malachi and Matthew has been receiving much attention from scholars, and rightly so, for it is of great importance for the true understanding of the New Testament; and those who would like to have in brief compass a bright and popular, yet reliable, survey of the life and literature of this 'period of the connections' may be recommended to read *The Bridge between the Testaments* (Scribner's; 7s. 6d. net), by Mr. Henry Kendall Booth. This author well succeeds in his aim of making the 'silent centuries,' as they have been misnamed, live again before his readers. And his book is much more than an 'introduction' to the Apocryphal Literature.

It begins with an historical survey of the period between the Testaments, gives an account of Eastern Judaism and its conservative and reactionary tendencies, then of Western Judaism and its subjection to Greek culture, and follows this up with a description of the Temple and the Synagogue, the progenitors of liturgical and non-liturgical churches respectively. The 'introduction' to the literature of the era, both canonical and non-canonical, is very useful, and the concluding chapters on the Unseen World and the Hope of the Centuries serve to complete the 'bridge.'

From the other side of the water comes a book with the curious title *The Man who dared to be God.* The author is the Rev. Robert Norwood, rector of St. Bartholomew's Church, New York (Scribner's; 10s. 6d. net). It is 'a story of Jesus,' and is in parts a sort of reconstruction. Such imaginative treatment of the gospel facts is, on the whole, to be discouraged unless it abides closely by ascertained truth. In the present case there is not much to find fault with. Neither is there very much to commend in any extreme degree. It is the humanity of Jesus that is portrayed. And that is to the good. But it is going very much too far to say of Jesus that He 'met with ease the crisis of adolescence, lifting up the glorious vitality of His manhood to that love which might one day be His to share with a woman. . . . He had an Oriental's pride of family, and looked without evasion upon the day when His father's name would be handed on by Him to posterity through His children'!

There is no place in the world that is more absorbed in problems of education than America, and especially in problems of religious education. America has no State system of religious training, of course. And this has driven the Churches to consider how that vast and various population is to be taught about God. There is a great deal of useful research work going on in American colleges, and the 'Project' principle is one result of that. It seems to have taken complete possession of American minds, so that hardly a book comes our way on this subject from the other side that is not founded on this principle. That might almost be said of the latest work, *What is Christian Education?* by Dr. George A. Coe (Scribner's; 10s. 6d. net). Almost, but not quite. For Dr. Coe takes a wider view. Let it be said, however, first that Dr. Coe is one of the best known educationists in America. No list of his writings is given in this volume, but they are numerous, and they have a great reputation. In the present work the author surveys the whole field, and his main thesis is as follows. In the past, education has been *transmissive.* That is to say, teachers have confined themselves to handing on to children the heritage of the past, in the case of religious education this means the Bible. What is needed to-day is *creative* education. Formerly education was material-centred. To-day it must be pupil-centred. The day of transmissive education is gone. The real principle of creative education is personality, and the aim is to develop the possibilities of personality.

All this (which, baldly stated, does not sound novel) is expounded at great length, through a large volume of nearly three hundred pages. Of course, there is more than merely this one contention. The whole subject is dealt with, but what has been said is the upshot. And of course the 'Project' principle occupies a large place, 'life-situations' and all that. The book is well worth reading, though it might have been shorter without disadvantage. Even its length and repetitions, however, serve to impress more firmly its central contention.

In 'The Christian Year' last month there was a short study on 'Catholicity of Mind.' This was taken from a sermon by the Rev. L. J. Baggott, M.A., Rector of Newcastle-under-Lyme, which appeared in *Religion of the New Era*, one of the latest volumes of Messrs. Stockwell's 'Peoples' Pulpit' (2s. 6d. net). There have been added lately to this cheap and good little series *Searching Sayings of Jesus*, by the Rev. J. E. Compton; *Faith Healing*, by the Rev. Alexander Hodge, B.A., B.D., Ph.D.; *The Puritan Heritage*, by the Rev. Ernest E. Johnston; *Christian Agnosticism*, by the Rev. F. H. Ballard, M.A.; *The Eternal Purpose*, by the Rev. R. Armstrong; *How to Handle Life*, by the Rev. Gwilym Rees, M.A.; *The Garden before the Cross*, by the Rev. John Bevan; *A Great Nation*, by the Rev. W. L. Stephen, M.A.; and *The Kingdom of God*, by the Lord Bishop of Durham.

The United Council for Missionary Education has just published through the Student Christian Movement the ninth of its series of new missionary biographies. This is the record of the notable work of *Tucker of Uganda, Artist and Apostle* (5s. net). It has been prepared by the Rev. Arthur P. Shepherd, B.D., of Leicester, and Lord Davidson of Lambeth has written a Preface full of praise of 'a Christian statesman endowed with unusual width of vision and with a penetrating power of loyal Christian judgment.' Bishop Tucker had himself published the story of his 'Eighteen Years in Uganda,' and his biography rather gains than loses by the lapse of fifteen years since his death, for now we see the remarkable strides of the Christian civilization of which Mackay of Uganda, and later Bishop Tucker, laid the first corner-stones in the region of that great inland sea, Lake Victoria. The son of a father and mother who were artists, and himself an artist who had had his paintings hung on the line in the Royal Academy, Alfred Tucker nevertheless decided, despite all opposition, that the Church was to be his vocation. His heart was always hankering after Africa, and to Central Africa he was sent as leader of a party, already on its way to Uganda. Bishop Hannington had been murdered; his successor, Bishop Parker, had died; but these untoward events, instead of discouraging Tucker, only made him more eager to stand in the breach, though this meant leaving his young wife and child at home. He set out from the coast on his eight hundred miles tramp to his destination, a young man of quite exceptional vigour, but when at last the bishop reached Uganda he was nearly blind and so weak that he had to be carried in a hammock. Less than a year ago, so great has been the change since 1890, the Prince of Wales, when he heard of the King's illness, was able to cover the distance by railway in a couple of days, and without risk of any kind. When the British Government decided to take over the Protectorate, Uganda became a different country. With the new control, came peace and prosperity. Two days after the bishop's return from a visit to England, he preached to six thousand men and women in the fine cathedral built by native labour, two thousand of them seated in the open air through lack of space.

It is a fascinating narrative from beginning to end that Mr. Shepherd has written of the wonderful development of the Uganda Church under Bishop Tucker's enthusiastic, far-sighted, and self-sacrificing leadership. One of the most notable among his visitors was Mr. Winston Churchill, then Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies, who was so greatly impressed by all he saw that he afterwards wrote of it in glowing terms. Failing health alone compelled Bishop Tucker's resignation. When I leave Uganda, he said, the one man I shall envy will be my successor.

The Unity of Body and Soul (S.C.M.; 8s. 6d. net), by Dr. F. Townley Lord, develops a view of human personality which links body and soul together in the varied experience of life, the approach to human personality being from the side of the body rather than the side of the soul. The book begins by showing that the Hebrew and Christian Scriptures attach much importance to the body in their doctrine of man, and that this tendency of thought perpetuates itself in the history of the Church, despite the essential spiritual emphasis of Christian teaching. The contribution of modern thought is then considered, and the conclusion reached that in view of the 'biological approach' to the study of human personality the bodily factors in human life must receive careful attention in a modern Christian anthropology. Finally, the normal activities of human life are considered in the light of the Christian position established.

The work is the substance of a thesis accepted by the University of London for the degree of D.D., and is obviously the product of much careful reading. It is usefully informative on the historical side, and succeeds in giving its subject a wide setting in the history of thought. The concluding section, dealing with such subjects as bodily culture, the achievement of personality, and the gates of death, if of little constructive value, opens up some interesting discussions. It is a book well worthy of a place on the book-shelves of the student of Christian thought.

Within recent years excavations in Palestine, Egypt, and other eastern lands have revealed treasures that throw considerable light on the New Testament. It is now possible to picture with some degree of accuracy the daily life of the people among whom Jesus and His apostles lived and worked. In *Treasures of the Dust* (S.C.M.; 4s. 6d. net) we have an account of recent excavation of this nature from the pen of a Dutch theological professor, Dr. M. Van Rhyn, of the University of Utrecht. The book, which has been translated into English by Winifrede T. Thompson, contains the story of present-day archæological research so far as it bears upon Biblical interpretation and history. Though a good deal of the information given exists in English already, there is much that will be new to those who are not versed in the untranslated works of German and Dutch scholars. The standpoint is moderately conservative, and the author seeks to confirm the textual integrity and historical trustworthiness of the New Testament records. The view is adopted that all the New Testament writings (with the possible exception of 2 Peter) may be assigned to the first century. The book avoids technicalities, and is intended for the general reader. It is an excellent one to put into the hands of those who desire a knowledge of the recent numerous discoveries in New Testament study.

Our Economic Morality, by Professor Harry F. Ward (Williams & Norgate; 8s. 6d. net), is of the nature of a big pamphlet directed against the short-comings of the capitalistic system as it has developed in America. In the preface the writer says, perhaps without sufficient reason, that ‘in most of the English-speaking world, certainly in England . . . much that is here written would be superfluous.’ The full title of the book is *Our Economic Morality and the Ethic of Jesus*, but there is all too little of the exposition of the latter. Whatever the writer’s real knowledge of the ethic of Jesus may be, he gives but slight evidence here of patient study or intimate acquaintance with it. Such a superficial and inaccurate remark as that ‘the Man who drove the excess profit-takers out of their customary place of business in the outer court of the temple is indeed unknown to most of those who write books about him,’ would be unpardonable in a serious historian or scientist. The weakness of Professor Ward’s work is that while it abounds in vigorous criticism it contains little that is constructive. It does not carry us far to be told that ‘when—following the ethic of Jesus—a man realises his dependence upon all as well as the dependence of all upon him, his relation to the Eternal Spirit becomes just as mutual as his relation to his fellow-men, particularly as he co-operates with cosmic energy in the economic process from which a purely theological religion and its God are excluded.’ As a strong protest against the dominance of the almighty dollar this book may serve a useful purpose, but one could have wished that the ethic of Jesus had been more patiently expounded and more persuasively commended.

‘The Dark Ages were not so dark but that they could see the next step,’ so Rainy used to tell us. Dr. Mellone goes much farther than that, and thinks that they can show us our next step, or rather the next three. *The Message of the Middle Ages to the Modern World* (Lindsey Press; 1s. 6d. net) holds that we are back at a time curiously like those days, and that we may well learn from them—that knowledge is sometimes a terrible thing (what are we going to do with our scientific discoveries, use them for peace or war?); that as the Church then ennobled mere swashbucklery into chivalry, so we must find a moral substitute for war which will storm and hold men’s hearts as war has done; and as they sought for a union of Christendom, so must we rise above mere nationalism in some way wiser and better than they found. A slight but interesting little book.

Rev. J. R. Fleming, D.D., continues to write upon Scottish Church History, and the standard of his former books is fully maintained in his most recent one—*The Story of Church Union in Scotland* (James Clarke; 3s. 6d. net). The period dealt with at greatest length is from 1900 to the present year. It is worth special treatment, of course.

The following books have also been received. A notice here does not preclude a fuller one later:

Abingdon Press—J. N. Davies, *Rightly Dividing the Word* ($2.00).
Allen & Unwin—
  W. S. Sadler, *The Truth about Mind Cure* (5s. net).
  Charles Gore, *Christ and Society*. Cheap Edition (2s. 6d. net).
  J. Klausner, *Jesus of Nazareth*. Second Edition (12s. 6d. net).
  J. W. Wheeler-Bennett and M. Fanshawe, *The World Court* (10s. net).
Allenson—
  Sunset and Sunrise, compiled by Cecilia Lady Boston (3s. 6d. net).
  A. Wallace, *Blazing New Trails* (2s. 6d. net).
Church Missionary Society—G. Phillips, *The Missionary's Job* (1s.).
Constable & Co.—A. W. Hopkinson, *Hope* (3s. 6d. net).
Epworth Press—F. Ballard, *Protestantism Justified* (1s. net).
Wells Gardner—E. A. Forbes, *East of the Chancel and West of the Font* (3s. 6d. net).
Holborn Publishing House—W. Potter, *Thomas Jackson* (2s. 6d. net).
Longmans, Green & Co.—
  R. H. J. Steuart, *The Inward Vision* (5s. net).
  Mother St. Paul, *Vita Christi* (5s. net).
Eneas Mackay—D. B. Morris, *Robert Louis Stevenson and the Scottish Highlanders* (5s. net).
Marshall, Morgan & Scott—
  Charlotte Bacon, *Where East meets West in China* (2s. 6d. net).
  J. Macbeath, *The Face of Christ*. New and Revised Edition (3s. 6d. net).
  P. W. Thompson, *The Whole Tithe*. Popular Edition (5s. net).
Milford—*The Four Gospels and the Acts of the Apostles in the A.V.* (2s. net).
Murray—R. H. Tawney, *Religion and the Rise of Capitalism*. Cheaper Edition (6s. net).
National Sunday School Union—E. H. Hayes, *More Yarns on Social Pioneers* (1s. net).
Pickering & Inglis—
  J. Smith, *Handfuls on Purpose*, vol. x. (4s. net).
  G. Goodman, *Great Truths Simply Stated* (2s. 6d. net).
  Seeing the Way to Heaven. Edited Hy. Pickering (3s. net).
Religious Tract Society—
  Edna V. Rowlingson, *Gathered Grain* (2s. 6d. net).
  W. J. Henderson, *The Pattern Boyhood* (2s. net).
  Constance L. Maynard, *The Fourfold Way* (2s. net).
  Mrs. G. R. Harding Wood, *The Women's Hour* (2s. net).
Fleming H. Revell Co.—G. Campbell Morgan, *The Gospel according to Mark*. Second Edition ($2.50).
Skeffington & Son Ltd.—H. van Cooten, *The Driving Force in Christianity* (1s. net).
Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge—
  Good Friday: A Manual for the Clergy (4s. net).
  S. K. Hutton, *An Eskimo Village* (2s. 6d. net).

◆

Synoptic Indications of the Visits of Jesus to Jerusalem.

By E. J. Cook, B.Litt.(Oxon.).

Professor C. J. Cadoux, in an article in one of the last issues of the *Expositor*,[1] pointed out the fact that the so-called 'Longer Interpolation' of Luke contains indications which make it impossible for us to accept it as the account of a more or less leisurely journey of Jesus from Galilee to His final Passover at Jerusalem. It seems, rather, to be a collection of incidents which happened on one or more previous visits and which have been grouped here after having had all definite marks of place and time removed. Professor Cadoux thinks these indications sufficient to show that the Johannine Feast-Visit chronology has some support in the source which Luke incorporated in the 'Greater Interpolation.'

The article is most valuable as far as it goes. But its weakness lies in the equating of the first Lucan indication of a previous visit to Jerusalem with the second (omitting the Passover of Jn $2^{13f.}$) visit recorded in the Fourth Gospel, a thing which, as we shall see later, does not seem to be necessary; and secondly, in a failure to find in Mark any indication of a previous visit.

Before beginning a discussion of the Marcan and Lucan material, it would, perhaps, be well to outline briefly the Johannine account of the Feast-Visits as a basis for our study.

---

[1] March, 1925.

I. The first visit (excepting the Passover of chapter 2, to which there is clearly no Synoptic parallel) recorded by the Fourth Gospel is that to the unnamed feast of chapter 5 (which ought evidently to be transposed with chapter 6[1]), probably Pentecost or possibly the Passover, mentioned in chapter 6, as being at hand. This comes after the collapse of the Galilean ministry, which has been produced by Jesus' announcement of His Messiahship and the meaning which He attaches to the term 'Messiah.' The purpose of the visit is the presentation of His claims to the religious leaders of the Jewish people. In such a case it is more than likely that Jesus would remove from His journey any elements of secrecy, if, indeed, He did not surround it with a certain amount of publicity.

The attack made on Jesus during the Feast, while finding its occasion in the healing of the infirm man on the Sabbath, was definitely induced by His claim to a unique relation with God, which the *Jews* interpreted as involving personal independence (Jn $5^{6, 18}$). Thus the meaning of His works and their relation to the works of God seem to furnish the chief note of His teaching and the main cause of the irritation of the religious leaders on the occasion of this Feast.

II. The second visit to the Feast of Tabernacles (Jn $7^{1-14, 25-52}$ 8^{21-59} 9. 10^{19-21}) is deliberately surrounded with secrecy, as is evidenced by the impression which Jesus gives to His brethren that He would take His time (if, indeed, He should go at all), by the questioning among the people (Jn 7^{11}), and the sudden appearance among them.

The character of the discussion and teaching during this Feast may be summarized as being a development over the previous one in that Jesus, while still maintaining His claim of unique relationship with God, advances to a disclosure of the sinful condition of the Jewish religious leaders (Jn 8^{21-24} 8^{39-41}), which was the real cause of their hostility to Him. This denunciation of their sin, however, does not seem to have aroused their fury to the same extent as His claim of unique relation to God and His denial that they have any real covenant connexion with the Father (8^{30-59}).

III. The visit to the Feast of Dedication (chap. 10) has little in the way of definite individual characteristics, and the teaching makes little advance over that of the previous visit.

IV. The final visit to the Passover of the Passion is related by all four Gospels.

In regard to Luke, the indications of visits to Jerusalem before the final Passover, which Professor Cadoux finds in the 'Greater Interpolation,' are as follows:

9^{51-56}	Jesus starts for Jerusalem and enters Samaritan territory.
9^{57}	He and His company are still on the road.
10^{1-20}	The mission and return of the Seventy.
9^{29-37}	The Parable of the Good Samaritan, with its notice of the Jerusalem-Jericho road.
10^{38-42}	Jesus is at the home of Mary and Martha, according to Jn 11 at Bethany, about two miles from Jerusalem.
11^{1}	He is in 'a certain place' praying.
11^{45-52}	Denunciation of the Jewish persecution of the prophets; perhaps at Jerusalem. Note allusion to the Temple in v.^{51}.
13^{1-5}	Call for repentance. Note the mention of sacrifices, Siloam, Jerusalemites, etc.
13^{10}	He teaches in one of the synagogues on the Sabbath.
13^{22}	He journeys through cities and villages on His way to Jerusalem.
13^{31-33}	He is warned to flee from Antipas; therefore He is in Galilee or Peræa.
14^{25}	Great crowds journey with Him.
17^{11}	*En route* to Jerusalem. He passes between Samaria and Galilee, probably toward the Jordan. Note also the Samaritan leper in the immediate connexion.

In these indications Professor Cadoux finds traces of three visits to Jerusalem, viz. (1) Lk 10^{25}–13^{9}; (2) Lk 18^{9-14}; (3) The Passover of the Passion. According to his analysis, there is nothing to correspond to the unnamed feast of the Fourth Gospel. He equates (1) with the visit to the Feast of Tabernacles; and (2) with that to Dedication. The difficulty, which Professor Cadoux himself recognizes, is that 'it is hard to recognize in the secret journey of the Fourth Gospel (Tabernacles) the leisurely and public progress described in Luke.'

This difficulty is eliminated if we divide the Lucan somewhat as follows:

(1) Lk 9^{51}–10^{42}	The unnamed Feast (Pentecost ?).
(2) Lk 11^{1}–13^{9}	Tabernacles.
(3) Lk 13^{22-33}	Dedication.
(3) Lk 14^{25}–19^{28}	The Final Passover.

Thus the leisurely and public progress of (1) would more or less agree with the conditions which seem to have surrounded the journey to the unnamed feast of Jn 5. The distinction between (2) and (3) need not be stressed, since, as we saw, there was little change in the attitude either of Jesus or of His opponents between Tabernacles and Dedication.

---

[1] Cf. Bernard, *ICC* on 'St. John,' vol. i. pp. xvii–xviii.

The question of Mark's knowledge of more than one visit of Jesus to Jerusalem is rather more subjective than even that of Luke, which we have been considering. It seems quite certain that, as far as the writer (or compiler) of the second Gospel is concerned, he knew of no visit besides the last. But a closer examination of the section, Mk $9^{30\text{ff.}}$, seems to indicate a knowledge in the sources which the Gospel in its present form does not yield.

The account of Jesus' final departure from Galilee begins at Mk 9^{30} instead of, as it is generally assumed, at 10^{1}, and the section Mk 9^{30-50} seems to be directed to preparing the disciples for the struggle which Jesus knew would sooner or later come to them, the import of which they could not grasp. The first foretelling of the Passion, the rebuke to the disciples for their rivalry, and the sayings in regard to the seriousness of discipleship all point to this.

At Mk 10^{1} there is a distinct notice of the beginning of a journey. Jesus comes from His retirement, crowds are surrounding Him, and His teaching assumes a more general character than in the previous section, $9^{30\text{ff.}}$. There are present Pharisees who, if the incident is in its proper place, must have been sent from Jerusalem for the special purpose not only of discrediting Him as a teacher but of seeking His removal by banishment or death, which is a continuation of the attempts noted in 3^{22} 7^{1}. The following incident of the one who inquires concerning the way to inherit eternal life shows that Jesus, in spite of the Pharisees, is still a popular teacher; and the question of Peter concerning rewards makes it clear that the disciples have by no means understood that the visit to Jerusalem has the seriousness which Jesus feels that it may have. The atmosphere of the section, as far as we can determine it, is more or less like that in the Fourth Gospel account of the visit to the unnamed Feast.

At 10^{32} there is a distinct change in the atmosphere. Jesus reiterates His statement of the approaching Passion. There is a tenseness and seriousness in the situation which is not evident in the previous verses. The crowds have disappeared. His teaching has lost its general character, and is directed entirely to His disciples, who are 'amazed' and 'afraid'—a quite different attitude from that in the preceding section. There is also an apparently unnecessary restatement of the fact that they are on the way to Jerusalem. This statement, together with the obvious change in the atmosphere, seems to point not to a single connected journey but to two different ones, made on two separate occasions.

From Jericho (Mk 10^{46}) Jesus and His disciples travel with the festal pilgrims to Jerusalem.

Thus, although there are no actual references which we can interpret as indications of more than one visit to Jerusalem, yet, when these abrupt changes in the atmosphere of the narrative are so evident, and when they correspond so closely with the Feast-Visits of the Fourth Gospel and the indications in the 'Greater Interpolation' of Luke, it seems likely that underneath the present narrative of Mark the sources indicate a knowledge of the visits which the present Gospel does not show on the surface. These changes in the atmosphere of the narrative seem more reasonable if we look on them as indications of separate journeys rather than as changes during the course of a single journey.

It would be absurd as well as impossible to attempt the making of a complete harmony between Mark, Luke, and John[1] in the matter of the chronology of the Feast-Visits. But these indications, slight as they are, serve to show us that the Fourth Gospel is not merely resorting to a useful fiction as the basis of its chronology, but that there is some sort of a real tradition which knew of Jesus visiting Jerusalem before the Passover of the Passion, and which is to be found in the Synoptics as well as in the Fourth Gospel.

---

[1] Matthew follows Mark exactly in this section, and does not require separate treatment.

◆

Books that have influenced our Epoch.

Glover's 'Jesus of History.'

By Professor J. A. Robertson, D.D., Aberdeen.

When away back about the years 1908–1909 there began to appear in *The Nation* certain articles on the Gospels by an unknown pen, some readers thought a new world of exposition had opened out before them. A penetrating ray of light seemed suddenly to have been flung upon the gospel pages. Rumours by and by emerged concerning the writer's name, for more articles were appearing, of the same type and quality, in *The Constructive Quarterly* and *The Expositor*, and these articles were signed by T. R. Glover. Then there appeared *The Conflict of Religions in the Early Roman Empire*, containing, among other remarkable sketches, a chapter, vivid and striking, on Jesus of Nazareth. By and by we heard that the writer was lecturing on the subject in India. The reading public was prepared for the book that was to follow, and *The Jesus of History* became 'a best seller' soon after its appearance. In particular it captured the student world, and had a widespread influence on university circles.

Here was a book which spoke in a new language to multitudes. It was the work of a mind that had approached the Gospels without preconceptions: the work of one who had come to his task, we felt, from a phase of scepticism, and who looked at the narrative with fresh eyes, making what had failed to be noticed by the over-familiarity of other minds stand out in a new way. In a series of graphic pictures he lit up corner after corner of the narratives, and made them glow with a new, a restored radiance. A fresh breath of reality blows about the story as it is unfolded in these pages. This, indeed, is one of the main achievements of the book. It has, for many, swept away the haunting suggestions of myth and legend with which some theorists would fain invest the gospel narratives. There had been promulgated in this country and in Germany the view that there never was any Jesus, but here was a clear light shining upon the gospel page, making plain to unbiassed eyes the solid fact that lies behind the records. In dealing with the insistence of the modern world upon fact, Dr. Glover says, 'The cynical view that delusion and error in a real world have peculiar power in human affairs may be dismissed. No serious student of history could hold it.' And he makes clear in this book that the gospel has not lived by reason of the delusion and error involved in the records, but that behind them there is the heart-beat of a great reality. The book has helped to slay the theory that there never was any Jesus.

The other great gain of the book is that it has given us a living and moving picture of the human Jesus. We had long been labouring under the burden of a dogmatic representation of Jesus, laden with conceptions from alien philosophies. The Christ of the Church was far from being Jesus as He actually is. And there was abroad over the land a hunger and thirst for something more human, more accessible. The success of this book is largely due to the fact that it was a timely answer to that demand. We see Jesus in His youth, growing as other children, and in His contact with the world of men, learning obedience by the things which He suffered. And there emerges a Figure sincere, simple, and attractive, intensely real and urgent and pressing in His demands upon men. The great 'Son of Fact,' Dr. Glover finely calls Him, adopting a phrase which Carlyle coined about Luther.

The book itself is built on very simple lines. It opens with a chapter on the 'Study of the Gospels,' in which the author points out that when Paul and Luther and Wesley gave Christ a new emphasis in human affairs, a new era followed the new emphasis. This, he says—and we have to remember that it is as a historian rather than as a theologian that he speaks—is the most striking and outstanding fact in history. There is, he continues, no figure in human history that signifies more. And the reason is that human nature is deeply and intensely spiritual, and Jesus satisfies it at its most spiritual point. Dr. Glover lays down three canons for the study of the Gospels or of Jesus' words. 'First, give the man's words his own meaning; second, make sure of the experience behind the thought; third, ask what type and of what dimensions must the nature be that is capable of that experience and that language.' And he goes on to ask, 'When we make our picture of Christ, does it suggest the Man who has stirred mankind to its depths, and set the world on fire?'

The chapter on 'The Childhood and Youth of

Jesus' is one of the freshest and most interesting in the book. By using the experience of Jesus as it can be gleaned from the Parables he lights up, by many a vivid little sketch, the story of those early days of our Saviour's life.

The chief point in the chapter on 'The Man and His Mind' is the emphasis laid on the instinct which Jesus manifested for reality. Glover calls Him, as we have said, 'the great Son of Fact.'

In the chapter on 'The Teacher and His Disciples,' the author suggests that Christ's method as a Teacher was based on the contagion of personality. 'One loving heart sets another on fire,' he quotes again and again.

The chapters which follow manifest a well-beaten plan. The teaching of Jesus upon God is analysed, and the relation of Jesus to man, His teaching upon man, and upon sin.

The chapter on 'The Choice of the Cross' is one of the least satisfactory in the book. Glover does not make it very clear what was the goal which Jesus set before Himself. But to this we shall return presently.

Then follows a chapter on 'The Christian Church in the Roman Empire,' in which the writer describes the tremendous hold which pagan religions had on the life of the time, and then goes on to demonstrate how this little insignificant sect of the Nazarenes, by their refusal to compromise, ultimately broke down and dissipated a world glutted with pagan deities.

The concluding chapter on 'Jesus in Christian Thought,' is, like 'The Choice of the Cross,' in some respects unsatisfactory. 'The first thing we need to learn,' says Dr. Glover, 'if our criticism of Jesus is to be sound, is that we are not at all so near to Him as we have imagined.' And yet he does little to show the immense distance that lies between Jesus and us. Moreover, he has admitted, earlier in the book, that 'behind the Gospels, simple and objective as they are, is the larger experience of the ever-working Christ.'

The two main defects of the book are these. First, Dr. Glover does not show us the Christ in action, pursuing the line of His supreme purpose, except to an inadequate extent in his chapter on 'The Choice of the Cross.' After all, these are largely impressionistic sketches, and they are most successful when there is some larger background on which to throw the picture, as in the case of his studies of 'The Childhood and Youth of Jesus.' Throughout the book we have only been catching isolated glimpses of Jesus, reacting to His environment, indeed, and not like a statue, fixed and in cold repose. But no picture of the Christ can be a living unity for us to-day unless we see Him in action, and action dominated by one abiding purpose. Unless we see all the elements in the character of Jesus fused into a whole by His will, by the concentrated passion by which He directed His life to its goal, we have not seen Him aright. We may depict His moral characteristics so as to bring out their flawless perfection, a perfection in which humanity touches, and is one with, the Divine, we may prove beyond any cavil of words the clearness and the constancy of His communion with God, His sense of the presence of God in His life, yet at no point would we be satisfied that we had captured and defined that something about Him which makes Him unique, sets Him over against our life somehow, and constrains us to worship and to adore. We are convinced that the point where we do come face to face with that something is His will, His conviction of a Divine vocation, His passionate and flawless fulfilment of that vocation. His life, in the highest and truest view of it, was the fulfilment of a Divine programme. But more, it was the fulfilment of a programme than which we can conceive of no higher occurring to the mind of God Himself for our world of humanity. It was the fulfilment of the supreme and eternal purpose of God for men. But more still. It was the conscious acceptance and *loyal* fulfilment of that programme. It is in that sense that He is still to us 'the Word,' the highest thought ever conceived in the mind of God, uttered forth at length in time.

And this leads us to the second main defect of the book. It is weak on the side of Christology. Just because Glover does not show us Jesus' life rising on the wings of this mighty purpose he does not show us wherein He partakes of the Divine. If ever the Divine meaning of life leapt out in earthly fields, if ever there was a moment in human history when men, sick for certainty, and tired of the dusty answers of the schools, were able to say, 'the truth about existence, the unveiled heart of the Eternal, is there, and it is too good to be false, God must be like that or there is no God,' it was when they saw this life, 'holiest among the mighty, mightiest among the holy.' If ever men confess faith in God with unfaltering conviction to-day, it is in presence of this Life which still haunts the world and refuses to be done with it.

He is still everywhere in the world, a strange, persistent visitor, knocking at the doors of the human conscience and the human heart. And until He brings God into our material age again, until we let Him bring the God He believed in, the God He dwelled in completely, the God who dwelled in Him, the God for whom He staked His existence in the grand adventure of an unwearied Love, the God to whom He pledged His unclouded soul, and with whom He kept His word to the end, the God who never was more manifest among men than on the Cross in the hour of darkness and dereliction and forsaking—we say until our age becomes accessible to that persistent knocking it will find no end to its restlessness nor any healing for its sin and its despair.

The Peace of Jesus.

By the Reverend Alexander Small, B.D., Boreham Wood, Herts.

The world is war-weary; the peoples desire peace. The hopes of men rise each time a fresh peace pact is signed. We must be grateful for every endeavour on the part of men to make war a thing of the past, and to bring about a universal peace; yet there is a real danger if we pin our faith to peace pacts, or, indeed, if we rely on any machinery to bring that permanent peace for which our hearts long. World-wide peace will be secured only as men more and more enter into the peace of which Jesus speaks, which is not of this world. Jesus, in the words of the text, contrasts the peace of the world with the peace that He is able to give. Let us try to discover wherein the difference lies.

1. *The Peace of the World.*—The peace of the world rests on financial security. That is a peace for which to some extent we all long. There is no gainsaying the fact that the possession of money and what money can buy does bring a certain peace of mind. If we know that all the money that we may require to meet our material needs will assuredly be forthcoming, we are saved from many an anxious moment, from many a sleepless night. If we can look forward to old age knowing that it is provided for, or be certain that in the event of sickness or accident we shall have sufficient for our needs, we enjoy a sense of security that brings with it quietness of mind. It is the knowledge that men seek this peace of mind that has brought insurance and assurance companies into being, and that in recent days has made some daily newspapers provide opportunities for their purchasers to insure against all kinds of contingencies. Yet there is a danger, however wise certain forms of insurance may be, that this endeavour after financial security may make it difficult for us to cultivate a healthy reliance upon God.

There are many who have not had this financial security in life. They have often wondered how provision was to be made for the future. They have known anxiety. Yet many such, for lack of the peace which the world gives, have sought that deeper and more lasting peace that the world cannot give but which Jesus offers.

Then, again, the peace of the world rests upon force. The presence and show of force do make for a certain kind of peace, whether it be in the form of armies and navies to inspire fear into the hearts of would-be aggressors, or in the form of a police force to preserve law and order in the homeland. The demonstration of force and the consequent fear that it inspires do tend to prevent the outbreak of war or of violence of other kinds. This, however, is true only to a limited extent; and we have all sufficiently long memories to know how inadequate the show of force was in 1914 to ensure even outward peace; and how futile it is to secure a true peace is evident when we realize that a real peace is dependent upon a renewal of the heart of man.

Then, further, the peace that the world offers is the peace of the sheltered life. The world says, 'Look after number one,' 'Don't undertake unnecessary responsibilities,' 'Don't worry about other people, for you will have plenty of worries of your own.' The world urges us to take the path of least resistance, the way of comfort and ease, if we would have peace. It is true we do find a certain kind of peace in this way, but it is a false peace; and carried to the extreme, it leads to an utterly selfish life.

This is the peace that the world offers, the peace of financial security, the peace based on the show of force, and the peace of the sheltered life. Now, says Jesus, as He is about to leave His disciples, 'Peace I leave with you, my peace I give unto you: not as the world giveth, give I unto you.' In what, then, does this peace of Jesus consist?

2. *The Peace of Jesus.*—First, in contrast to the peace of the world that rests upon financial security, Jesus offers the peace of faith. The peace that comes from the sense of financial security may be disturbed at any time, by a reverse of fortune, by the failure of a bank, by the fall of securities, by bad trade, or by industrial disputes: that peace is not secure. One of the distinguishing marks of this peace of Jesus is that it is not dependent upon outward circumstances, but is secure amid all the circumstances of life. The peace of Jesus comes from a steadfast faith in God; it is not dependent upon outward props, but upon an inward attitude. It depends for its security upon the assurance that God will never fail those that trust in Him. That does not mean that such will never know financial straits, or that they will never be faced by circumstances that seem desperate. They may suffer many a reverse of fortune, they may be in many a difficult position; but their faith in God will keep them in peace because their hearts are stayed upon Him.

With most of us that faith is something for which we strive, something which we hold as an ideal. With Jesus our ideal was real; He had perfect peace because He had perfect faith. That, then, was part of the legacy that He passed on to His disciples, the peace of faith.

Then, as against the peace that the world offers by the demonstration of force, Jesus offers the peace of love. Faith is the attitude of men toward God that brings peace; love is the attitude of men towards their brethren that ensures peace. Love is the only thing that secures peace in human relationships. We know that while there is the outward peace that the show of force brings, hatred may exist alongside of it. If men loved one another, there would be no need of armies and navies; the duties of the police force would be greatly reduced. When love enters our hearts, we have the peace of Jesus, a peace that the world cannot give, a peace permanent and secure.

That was part of the legacy that Jesus bequeathed to His disciples—the peace of love. Jesus possessed it in largest measure; His faith in God was perfect; His love toward men was perfect too. Men sought to destroy that peace of Jesus by reviling Him, by spitting upon Him, by buffeting Him, and at last by crucifying Him; but the more bitter the opposition, the more intense the hatred, the greater the depths of love that He revealed, and the more secure His peace.

'How much of the unrest of our hearts comes from wrong relationships with others? How much of the misery of our hearts comes from treasured grudges, from the refusal to forgive one who has injured us, from bitterness and ill-will?' 'Peace I leave with you,' says Jesus; and His peace is the peace of love.

Then, lastly, while the world offers us the peace of the sheltered life, Jesus offers us the peace of service, service that involves responsibility, service that takes us out of the calm security of the world's peace into storm and conflict, yet in the midst of it all we may have peace. The sheltered life brings us a false peace, the life of service a true peace. It was that peace that Jesus gave to His disciples, and it was a peace that Jesus possessed in fullest measure.

Jesus did not know the peace of a sheltered life. He never sought escape from responsibilities or from risks that would bring greater security to others. We see nothing of the sheltered life as He goes from place to place ministering to the sick, comforting the sad, facing the fury of the Scribes and Pharisees. There is nothing of the sheltered life as we see Him in Gethsemane and at the Cross, voluntarily chosen; we see the storm breaking in all its fury upon Him. The life of Jesus was a life of fullest possible service.

These words of Jesus were spoken when He was within a few hours of the Cross. How strange they seem to us in that setting: 'Peace I leave with you, my peace I give unto you.' There was no shelter for Him that the world could offer. He might have escaped, but that would have been to be untrue. Jesus found His peace in service to the uttermost, a service that was a complete fulfilment of God's will and that manifested a perfect love for men.

This greatest of all boons in life, peace of mind and heart, Jesus offers to us, as He offered it long ago to His disciples; but it can be ours only as we follow the path of faith, love, and service which He Himself trod before us.

◆

Should 'Things strangled' be omitted from Acts xv. 29?

By Hugh J. Schonfield, London.

In the course of some recent studies in the Sermon on the Mount I made a discovery, though perhaps this is rather too strong a term, which happens to throw light on the vexed question of the text of the Apostolic decree in Ac 15. The new evidence which I am able to bring forward seems to show that the Western Text is right in omitting 'things strangled' from the number of prohibitions. The late Professor Peake discussed the problem in a recent article.[1]

'The question as to the decree and the four prohibitions,' he wrote, 'is one of the most tangled problems in the history of the early Church. There is, in the first place, a serious variation of text. According to the generally accepted text we have apparently three food prohibitions combined with one ethical. But there are very early and important witnesses which omit the reference to "things strangled." If this text is correct, it is still possible to suppose that, apart from the ethical, we have two food prohibitions. But the removal of "things strangled" makes it possible to take all three as ethical, that is, as prohibitions of idolatry, murder, and impurity.'[2]

It is well known that the evidence of the earliest MSS is against the omission, while the external evidence is in favour. If 'things strangled' is retained, it is very difficult to regard the decree as historical. As Canon Wilson says: 'There is the incongruity, which must have struck every one, of coupling with these food-laws the prohibition of fornication, as if it were on a level with them. There is the unaccountable omission of all mention of circumcision, which from 15^5 we see was the thing chiefly insisted on. There is the inconsistency of saying in the decree that "they would not trouble them which from among the Gentiles turn to God," and then imposing on them food-laws which there is evidence to show were not generally observed among the Jews of the Dispersion, as seems also to have been admitted by St. Peter (15^{10}). There is the statement, in the Bezan text, of Ac 21^{25}, "we sent, giving judgment that they should observe nothing of that sort." There is the strange statement (in 15^{31}) that, when the decree was reported at Antioch, "the multitude rejoiced for the consolation." There is the still more inexplicable fact that St. Paul, shortly afterwards, when the question about the eating of meat "sold in the shambles" (1 Co 10^{25}) which had been offered to idols, does not allude to this decree, while he absolutely forbids (1 Co 10$^{20, 21}$) sharing in idol feasts. And, finally, there is the fact that no Western Father, or apologist, or hostile critic, ever alludes to such a food-law as enjoined on Christians. If it ever existed it was ignored from the first.'[3]

In his next paragraph the same writer concludes that 'if the words "things strangled" were not in the decree, the natural interpretation of the decree would, beyond all question, have been that it forbade the three great sins of *idolatry*, *murder*, and *fornication*; and was, in fact, a purely moral law.'[4]

Professor Peake found it 'extraordinary that the Gentile disciples should be told that nothing more would be required from them than to abstain from idolatry, murder, and fornication. The reference to murder in particular,' he felt, 'is difficult to accept. It is hardly credible that it should be necessary to prohibit this in Christian Churches.'[5] He therefore decided 'that the text with four prohibitions is correct, three of these having definitely to do with forbidden forms of food.'[6]

Will not the difficulty be overcome, if it can be proved that it was just these three ethical commandments that were regarded by the Pharisees and by the Lord Jesus Himself as fundamental for society? So we have it already in the Mishnah: 'Captivity enters the world on account of idol-worship, fornication, and bloodshed.'[7]

Elsewhere, it is said, 'Whoso slandereth his neighbour committeth sins as great as idolatry, fornication, and murder.'[8] And, indeed, so fundamental were these three commandments regarded by the Rabbis in the stress of the times that they declare, 'Any sin denounced by the Law may be committed by a man if his life is threatened, except the sins of idolatry, fornication, and murder.'[1]

---

[1] 'Paul and the Jewish Christians,' *Bulletin of The John Rylands Library*, Jan. 1929, pp. 31–62.

[2] P. 45.

[3] *The Acts of the Apostles, translated from the Codex Bezæ*, Introduction, pp. 16–17.

[4] *Ibid.* Canon Wilson notes the association in Rev 22^{15}, 'Without are the fornicators, and the murderers, and the idolaters.'

[5] P. 47.

[6] P. 48.

[7] *Aboth*, v. 11.

[8] *Erech.* fol. xv. B.

To the Jewish religious authorities, then, the commandments concerning idolatry, fornication, and murder were τούτων τῶν ἐπάναγκες 'these compulsory things,' exactly what the Jewish Christian elders and apostles call them in the decree (15^{28}).

The Sermon on the Mount is evidence that this view was held by the Pharisees at an earlier date, for Jesus, in setting forth the righteousness of the Law which should exceed that of the Pharisees, comments first on these very same commandments; murder (Mt 5^{21}), fornication (Mt 5^{27}), and idolatry (Mt 5^{33}). It may be objected that the last deals not with idolatry but oaths. But this is answered by understanding that Jesus condemned swearing on the ground that it indirectly countenanced idolatry. The heathen might suppose, if Jews swore by any created thing, that they too were polytheists. And if Jews accustomed themselves to such oaths they might be led to use the oaths of the heathen as well, and so God's name would be profaned. Hence the Rabbis forbade partnership with a heathen, 'lest at any time the heathen should impose an oath on the Jew, and he be obliged to swear by the heathen's idol; and the Law says (Ex 23^{13}), "Make no mention of the name of other gods, neither let it be heard out of thy mouth."'[2]

We may infer, I think, that Jesus knew of the Pharisee teaching on the fundamental character of these commandments.

Professor Peake admitted that ethical prohibitions would harmonize better with all the circumstances than food-laws, but he was too honest a scholar to adopt this interpretation without a valid reason and merely to evade a difficulty. Perhaps the additional evidence which I have adduced may be found adequate to show that after all there is justification for omitting 'things strangled,' and that on this issue, at any rate, the Western text is to be preferred.

---

[1] *Sanhed.* fol. lxxiv. A.

[2] *Sanhed.* fol. lxiii. B.

In the Study.

Virginibus Puerisque.

White Keys and Black.

By the Reverend James S. Stewart, B.D., Aberdeen.

'Making melody in your heart to the Lord.'—Eph 5^{19}.

Not long ago there died in New York a very famous African. His name was Aggrey, and he was a negro, one of the blackest of the black. He was a great teacher and a superb orator. Best of all, he was a Christian and a saint. He spent all his days trying to make the black folk and the white folk better friends. He lived for that. There was one illustration he used again and again. 'Think of a piano,' he would say. 'You can play some sort of a tune on the white keys of a piano; you can play some sort of a tune on the black keys; but to produce real harmony you must play both the white and the black keys.' You see? Aggrey meant that the world is God's piano, and God's piano, like every other, has its white notes and its black notes, and inside it the most glorious music is slumbering, wonderful melodies and harmonies waiting for the great Master to come and bring them out by His touch; and God can play some sort of a tune on the white notes, and some sort of a tune on the black notes, but what God really wants to do is to play a 'Hallelujah Chorus,' and of course for that God needs the white notes and the black notes as well.

Some of you are learning the piano. Think of your scales. They are perfectly horrid things, of course, and you simply can't get your thumb under in time, and that little finger just won't wait for his turn, and majors are dreadfully difficult, and minors are twenty times worse, while as for F sharp minor, why, if you could only meet the man who invented it you would tell him what you thought of him. I know. Still, let us think of scales. If you were to use the white notes only, how many scales do you think you could play? Only one, the scale of C. And if you were to use the black notes only, how many could you play? None at all! But you don't like scales. Nobody does. Well then, let us think of pieces. I wonder if I could guess the first piece you ever played? 'The Bluebells of Scotland,' wasn't it? Well, you try playing 'The Bluebells of Scotland' without using any black notes at all. You can't! Certainly it only needs one black note, and you suspect that that poor black note must feel like the one black sheep in a flock of white ones, rather lonely and lost and sorry for itself; but all the same you mustn't miss it out, or the melody won't be a melody any longer. And if it is so difficult to find a piece without any black notes, do you think you could find one without any white notes? I think that once Chopin, or Liszt, or some one like that, did compose a piece that could be played on the black keys only, but it must be the only one in existence. It comes to this—you can't get real music at all, unless you use both white keys and black.

That is just like life. Life has its white notes and its black notes, its bright experiences and its dark ones.

Take your Christmas holidays, for instance. 'Oh, if it could only be holidays always!' you say. 'If only there were none of those stupid sums to do at night, no tiresome essays about the adventures of a shilling, no irregular verbs; if only the holidays would never stop, instead of galloping past and being ended almost before we knew they had begun, what a splendid life it would be!' Don't you believe it! A life all holidays would soon have you bored to tears. The melody and the music of it would stop. We need the dark keys of discipline and duty as well as the white keys of laughter and joy.

Or take the weather. 'Why can't the sun always shine?' you complain. 'It was going to have been such a great game last Saturday, and I was picked for the team, and everybody was coming to see the match, and we hardly slept a wink for two whole nights for excitement; and then Saturday came, and down came the rain in torrents, and the game was off. Why can't it be sunshine always?' Well, you know, there are some places where the sun does shine always, or nearly always—the South Sea Islands, for instance. But do you know what they have found about the people there? Most of them are lazy and soft, and their very souls are flabby. But in lands where mists are grey and winds are biting, they breed men of muscle and grit and character. We need the dark days, as well as the bright days, to bring life's music out.

Or take your troubles. Everybody has some. Jesus has said we must have some. But why? 'Why can't I be happy always?' you ask. 'Why should things sometimes go wrong, and people misunderstand, and life hurt so badly?' Ah, that is just God's fingers straying from the white keys for a little, and touching the black keys. But then the music of your life will be all the deeper for that, and the melody all the more wonderful. Perhaps it may even grow so wonderful that the angels themselves will stoop down to listen to it.

Remember—you can play some sort of a tune on the white keys, and you can play some sort of a tune on the black keys: but both are needed, white keys and black, if you are really to 'make melody in your heart to the Lord.'

Jesus' House: A Christmas Address.

By the Reverend S. Greer, M.A., Ayr.

'The Word was made flesh.'—Jn 1[14].

When on holiday you have sometimes gone to see the house where a famous man used to live, and you are greatly thrilled. 'Just think,' you say, as you stand before a plain brick house in Warwickshire, 'Shakespeare lived there,' and, as you enter with the crowd from every part of the world, you reverently take off your cap. Or you are visiting Edinburgh, and having, of course, read *Treasure Island*, and recited 'The Lamplighter,' you go to see the house in Heriot Row 'with a lamp before the door,' and you almost imagine you can see at the window the pale, eager face of little Louis Stevenson with wistful eyes watching for 'Leerie going by.' How romantic that makes a house; it's not just a plain house any more, when somebody big has lived in it.

And Jesus came to live at our House—I mean the house that our body is. Think how, at the first Christmas in Bethlehem, He entered the lowly doorway of human life, and dwelt in human flesh, just like ours. Francis Thompson in a lovely child-prayer tells about it:

'Little Jesus, wast Thou shy
Once, and just so small as I? . . .
Hadst Thou ever any toys,
Like us little girls and boys? . . .
Didst Thou kneel at night to pray,
And didst Thou join Thy hands this way? . . .
And did Thy Mother at the night
Kiss Thee, and fold the clothes in right? . . .
Thou canst not have forgotten all
That it feels like to be small . . .
So, a little Child, come down
And hear a child's tongue like Thy own.'

Great artists loved to paint pictures of the Baby Jesus in His Mother's arms, and they always made Him look like the babies of their own country. That was natural, and it is right. Old legends tell of wonderful things which Jesus did when a child: how once, when His mother was thirsty in the desert, He thrust His finger into the sand, and a well of water gushed up. But when we think of Jesus as a Child, we should imagine the dearest little fellow we have ever known. For He lived in our little house of life. And when He had grown up, the love of God looked out of human eyes, and spoke through human lips, and the kindness of God was shown by human hands.

Doesn't that make our body very wonderful and very sacred? 'Your body is a temple,' says the Bible; of course it is, since Jesus inhabited one. Nothing, then, must be permitted that would abuse or defile our body. There are powers and desires in us which must be brought to heel, and held in leash with a strong hand. Frankly, I know of no other way than to hand over control to Christ.

Who is your great hero? Is it Sir Alan Cobham, or that famous cricketer, or well-known footballer, whose exploits you follow with amazed delight? If he were to come to stay with you for even a night, wouldn't you be mighty proud? There would be no living with you at school! And you would develop just the same slight swagger (only not so slight) in your walk, and the same way of holding your head that he had, and your home-folk would smile to note how well you had caught his very accent.

Was there ever a hero like Jesus?—the bravest that ever breathed. He walked straight up to His bitterest enemies, and faced a howling mob without a falter. And He went through torture and death, rather than be unfaithful. What a Comrade He was to those who knew Him; just to have looked in His eyes pulled a fellow together again, and made him feel bold as a lion. The whitest Man who ever lived—how He scorned falsehood, and hated a sham!

And He came to live at our House! We must try to catch His accents. Only courage and kindness must look out at our eyes, for eyes were the windows by which Jesus looked so bravely and gently out upon the world. Only words true and pure must pass our lips, for lips were the door by which His wonderful words went forth to help and to bless. Christmas is Jesus' birthday. People give one another presents then to show how happy they are because He came. What about a gift for Jesus on His birthday? What about giving Him the gift He most wants—our love and loyalty?

The Christian Year.

Fourth Sunday in Advent.

Waiting upon God.

'My soul waiteth upon God: from him cometh my salvation.'—Ps 62[1].

'In returning and rest shall ye be saved; in quietness and in confidence shall be your strength.'—Is 30[15].

Man has been searching for God since religion dawned, and each one of us has to search for God, if He is to be real in our lives. Religion calls for effort, exploration, experiment. Our spiritual nature has to be trained before it can make adequate response to its spiritual surroundings. But man's search for God is not the deepest truth about religion. Behind man's search for God lies God's search for man. There would have been no religion if God had not from the first implanted in human nature the religious impulse. Having created in man the desire to know Himself, would God have left him without guidance? The picture of God which the Bible offers is of One who seeks to make man a sharer in His truth, who progressively reveals Himself to man according to man's capacity to understand. It is not God's wish to live in isolated splendour. It is His nature to go out of Himself and express Himself in a created universe. Spirit is always creative, and God is Spirit. God, says the Bible, made man in His own image, gave him, that is, a share of the Divine nature, so that he might hold fellowship with his Maker. If that is the basal truth about man, then God must have wanted to make that fellowship as rich as possible. And He did it, as we believe, by giving, not all at once, but gradually, a revelation of Himself. So that behind all human discovery of God lies God's unfolding of Himself. Between man's discovery and God's revelation no sharp line can be drawn.

This thought of the Divine initiative, of God going out to search for man that He may gradually educate him in knowledge of Himself, has important practical consequences for our everyday religious life. It suggests that our highest wisdom may be to follow the advice so often given in the Psalms and 'wait upon God.' A wood or a meadow is full of sounds, which we do not hear if we walk rapidly through them. But if we lie down under a tree or in the long grass and listen, we become aware of this world of varied sound.

So it is with God. He speaks in the secret places of the soul.

Prayer is always effort, for there must be the sustained effort of concentration; but at least as important in prayer as our strivings and wrestlings with God are our deliberate relaxation and quiet expectancy of what He may have to tell us.

It is interesting to note how modern psychology is emphasizing the importance of passivity in the formation of character. We are told that the imagination has proved itself to be stronger than the will, and hence that victory over temptation is not to be had by the road of strenuous struggle and volitional effort. A man, let us suppose, who has been the victim of some evil habit, makes up his mind one day that he will have done with it. He says to himself, 'I *will* snap this chain which binds me.' But he fails. Psychology tells us that he did the wrong thing in so acting. What he ought to have done was, not to struggle, but to suggest to himself that he was certain to conquer.

Are we right in such a case as this of speaking of a conflict between the will and the imagination? It is doubtful if we are; because the essence of an act of volition is attention. We attend to the thing we want to do, and when we have concentrated our minds long enough upon it, action follows of necessity. Here, before any suggestion of victory can take effect, the man must attend to the suggestion, and that is an act of will. He must steadily hold before his imagination the idea of himself as conqueror. The conflict is not so much one between will and imagination as between two aspects of will, between will as violent struggle, and as quiet attention to an end to be realized. The will is the crown of human personality, and any teaching which minimizes its importance or robs it of its supremacy in the guidance of life is to be deprecated.

Religious teachers have always known that in the up-building of character the negative method of repression is never as effective as the positive method of expansion. We must, of course, pull out the weeds in our lawn if we wish it to be good turf; but it is just as important to see that the grass is sown thickly, so that there is less room for weeds to find foothold.

The unhesitating verdict of Christian experience is that man is not left to struggle alone. 'I can do all things through Christ who strengtheneth me.' St. Paul had no greater certitude in his life than that he was receiving power from Jesus Christ.

Let us assume that to be true, and then see how the situation is changed for the man whose case we have been discussing. He has struggled painfully and persistently in the past and has failed. Now he is going to adopt the advice of the psychologist and try the more passive method. He is going to suggest to himself that he is already victorious. He is going into the fight, having banished the haunting memories of earlier defeats with the fear which they engender, his imagination filled with the bright vision of himself with a new character, cleansed and attracted by the good. Is that enough? Would not his self-suggestions be far more powerful if he could say to himself, 'I see myself made new by *the power of God*; I know that, if I open my heart to receive Him, Jesus Christ the Friend of such storm-tossed people as myself will give me His living sympathy and His aid'? To 'wait upon God' is a more effective thing to do than to wait upon an idea of ourselves as renovated characters, once we grant that the Spirit of the Living God can really enter into human personality. Of all the suggestions which we can make to ourselves when we set out to break the fetters of a cramping past, none is more powerful than the suggestion that God is waiting to help us. The suggestion gains, of course, in value in proportion to the adequacy and spirituality of our conception of God. And it is here that Christianity holds the field against all other religions, because of the marvel and attractiveness of its picture of God.

The man who waits upon God is ready to believe that God can really work in his life, can do things in and through him; and he acts upon that belief, not only by having definite times when he deliberately seeks to realize the presence of God, but by preserving, as a master principle of his life, the temper of expectancy.

In the story of St. Paul we have an illustration of the contrast between the two tempers we have been discussing. Before his conversion he was the struggler, trying to keep the whole law, fighting to be 'righteous' by a stern process of self-discipline. After his conversion, though he did not relax his efforts to live up to the higher standard of Christian living, he had taken the momentous step of committing himself to Jesus Christ, as to One who could mould his life and heighten his natural powers. Henceforth, he walks as a man who knows that the secret of noble and happy living lies in putting God first; in trusting Him for what He is, and for what He has done; in waiting upon Him in the quiet confidence that He is a source of life and power.

Not otherwise was it with Jacob when he wrestled with his strange opponent in the night by the brook Jabbok. The hour of Jacob's weakness proved to be the hour of his strength: he received the blessing; the blessing of the new name which signified the new character. No more was he to be called Jacob or Deceiver, but Israel or Perseverer with God. When his natural strength was rendered powerless the blessing came. Then, and not till then, could God work in Jacob the change He longed to effect. Jacob had to be passive before God, had to wait upon God, before God could transform him.

In the Lord's Prayer, as has often been pointed out, before we make any petition for ourselves, we are bidden to wait upon God. 'Our Father, which art in heaven.' God is, and He is a Father, and He is in heaven. Heaven is where God is, and if we would draw near to Him in prayer we must first try to be in heaven ourselves, and realize His presence.

Our temper must be one of reverence and awe—the quiet solemnity of the man who is coming into the presence of the Great Father of his spirit. 'Thy kingdom come.' We link ourselves up with the purposes of God. We think of the accomplishment of His will; we want to be one with that will, to have no will of our own, but to put ourselves entirely into His hands that He may use us as His agents. That is the kind of atmosphere in which waiting upon God becomes a reality.[1]

CHRISTMAS DAY.

A Christmas Sermon.

'And this shall be a sign unto you; Ye shall find the babe wrapped in swaddling clothes, lying in a manger.'—Lk 2^{12}.

When we stand at the source of a great river and see a tiny spring bubbling from the earth, it is difficult to realize how that trickling little fountain can grow into the mighty stream which rolls onward in majestic strength, enriching half a continent with its waters.

A like feeling of difficulty, if not of incongruity, must have been present to the mind of the shepherds when they were told by the angel to look for the Saviour long promised in a place and in circumstances which seemed so incompatible with His greatness; and not only so, but to find in those very circumstances the mark of that Divine Presence and Power for which they looked, and which was to enrich humanity with the waters of spiritual life through all coming time.

Who among us could have stood by that manger bed, amid those mean surroundings where the brute beasts of the field were gathered for shelter, who among us could have stood there and dared to dream of any future for that child, but a life of obscure toil? But we know that this Infant's name after eighteen centuries is the most potent influence upon earth, and that on this morning throughout the whole world the voice of thanksgiving is rising from millions of souls whose thoughts are turned to Bethlehem. We therefore see in this lowly birth more than is open to the eye of the passing spectator. We see that the swaddling clothes and the manger bed have a deep significance; that they are the sign of something infinitely great which is yet to unfold itself. The first lesson of Christmas Day is, therefore, the all-important lesson that Christ our Saviour is not merely the Son of Mary, but the Eternal Son of God, and though for us He has emptied Himself of His glory, He is still Christ the Lord.

But while this is to be remembered, it is also to be particularly noted how the Divine power of our Saviour is manifested—intimately bound up with the humility and weakness of earth. The Saviour of men must also be a man. He must enter human life not as a superhuman being, but by the natural gate of human birth. He must sound all the depths of human experience. There must be no man or class of men who cannot be reached by His sympathy, or He cannot be a Saviour to them, and therefore we see in the swaddling clothes and the manger a sign of the purpose for which He came. The same sign of humility which marked His birth was present to the end. If the manger at Bethlehem was the cradle of the Eternal, and if through it we see the childhood of man encircled with a halo from heaven, we also see the workshop at Nazareth ennobling human labour, and the Cross on Calvary making suffering Divine.

And so we see that this tendency to express itself in the natural and ordinary forms of life is a characteristic of our Saviour's whole work, and of the gospel which in His name we preach. This indeed is the deepest sign of its Divinity. It comes to us in the garb of common life. It is brought to us in great simplicity in swaddling clothes, and because of its humiliation it wins its way to the hearts of common men and is felt by them to be Divine.

What is thus true of Christ and of the work which He came to do is also true more generally of all spiritual realities. They come to us under natural forms, but the natural forms are only valuable as signs of a Divine truth. There is always this double aspect, according as we look with the eye of faith or merely with the eye of sense. Even in the simplest natural acts and relations there is an outer and an inner, and the outer is the sign of the inner. Little acts which in themselves and to the eye of sense mean nothing, to the eye of faith and love are full of a rich and deep meaning. The whole world is full of signs and symbols. Indeed, is it anything more than a sign of a thought in the mind of God? At any rate this earth on which we walk is something more to the eye of faith than it is to the cynical; it is the work of our Father, and the sign of His presence, and the sphere of our Saviour's life.

---

[1] V. F. Storr, *The Living God*, 44.

The same may be said more particularly of the forms in which Christ's influence has been brought to bear upon our lives. Take, for instance, the simple rites in which our Lord ordained that the beginning and continuance of spiritual life should be marked and provided for: the Sacrament of Baptism in which through the simple element of water the great gift of spiritual purity is exhibited, the Sacrament of the Supper in which through the simple elements of bread and wine the great fact of His death is for us expressed and brought as a living influence to our lives. To the outer eye neither of these rites has any meaning—both are utterly inadequate to the purpose—but to the eye of faith they are the sign of that which is invisible, of the presence of Him who, though He is the Eternal God and endowed with the plenitude of Divine power, emptied Himself of all and took upon Him our common nature, and was first seen to mortal eye as a little child wrapped in swaddling clothes, lying in a manger. To this, therefore, we return as the great truth for Christmas Day, the source of all its gladness. Jesus Christ was born this day, and by His lowly birth He has lifted all human lives, however weak and worthless, into the light of God's Eternal truth.

The mind which is nearest to God, even while engaged in the commonest duty of the day, will move amid a world of glory and truth. Is it not true that as we go about our affairs from day to day the sun comes forth and floods the world with beauty, and night after night the stars fill the deep of heaven and shine over us like a city of God? And yet our eyes are holden that we cannot see, and still we trudge onward with our faces downward, blind to the glories of our birth. Is it not also true that just as the heavens we see enswathe our earthly home, so also our spiritual life is enswathed by the heaven of Divine truth? The sun of righteousness has arisen with healing in His wings. And shall we walk in darkness when this great light is given to us?[1]

First Sunday after Christmas.

The Evangel of Experience.

'Now I would have you know, brethren, that the things which happened unto me have fallen out rather unto the progress of the gospel.'—Ph 1[12] (R.V.).

Paul was one of those rare men who make light of their misfortunes. He sums up his difficulties in a single phrase—'the things which happened unto me'—and one of these happenings was that he was now in prison. But he had learned the difficult art of turning awkward circumstances to the best account, and thus it is that we find the good news of Christ travelling throughout the whole prætorian guard.

The materialist thinks of the restricted liberty, of the galling chain; he forgets that he still has a free mind, a liberated spirit, an imagination on which no hand can be laid. What was prison to John Bunyan? The jail at Bedford became the birthplace of a Dream which will last as long as Time. Where was Ezekiel when 'the heavens were opened' and he saw 'visions of God'? He was among the captives by the river Chebar. That is not captivity. No man is a captive who sees visions of God. He is the real prisoner who has the carnal mind, who is cursed with dark, self-centred thoughts.

Paul tells the story of his life to the soldier who guards him: the guard is relieved, and he tells the next: the men tell their comrades, and at length the Apostle can write—'Thus it has become notorious among all the Imperial guards, and everywhere, that it is for the sake of Christ that I am a prisoner; and the greater part of the brethren, made confident in the Lord through my imprisonment, now speak of God's message without fear, more boldly than ever.' Such is the contagious influence of a man filled with one aim, fired with one enthusiasm, devoted to one service.

A man's own religious experience, working itself out through ordinary events, may thus become an evangelistic medium. The equipment of an evangelist is comprised not so much in a dramatic theology as in a dramatic experience. It is not contained in a set of doctrinal statements or conventional religious phrases, but rather in the things that have happened to him. The spirit of Jesus Christ works its way in the individual, and outward to the universal. For no man lives to himself or dies to himself. A man may perhaps never speak to another of Jesus Christ, and yet he may win that man for Christ. Character has more force than eloquence.

---

[1] A. W. Williamson, *The Glorious Gospel*, 161.

The things that happen to us make up our experience. A man's biography is the record of the things that happen *to* him and *in* him. Things begin to happen to us as soon as we make our appearance on the stage of life; so that if experience be an evangelizing agency there need be no delay in the furtherance of truth. How does this happening process work out? Things often fall out to the progress of the gospel unconsciously. We use the word gospel in its largest significance, meaning by it the spirit of love, tenderness, sympathy, long-suffering, sacrifice; it includes everything that softens, deepens, purifies, and elevates the heart of mankind. In that case we can see how the things that happened to us even in our earliest years may have fallen out to the progress of the gospel.

Take the case of *home life*. The things that happen there should be on this upward and advancing line. Parents have the progress of the gospel committed to their charge. The things that happen to the child at home are largely in the hands of fathers and mothers. What kind of an atmosphere are we seeking to create at home? What sort of a Sunday have we at home? The Sunday ought to be one of the brightest days of the week. If the inmates of any home look forward with delight to the approach of Sunday, the things which are happening there are at least tinged with the radiance of God's own sunshine.

Take the idea of the text in regard to *education*. The schoolmaster does not get his due. He is one of the most important factors in life. The schoolmasters of a country ought to be among the finest characters of a country. They should be picked men, Christian in the noblest and completest sense of the term, because they exert influence over young life during its most critical and impressionable period.

How true it is also in the matter of *companionship* that the things which happen to us may fall out to the progress of the gospel. Our friends determine the quality if not the course of our history more than we can tell. If we be really knit to any true friend, there is an unfathomable element in our redemption. These invisible ties keep us right sometimes when we are absent one from another. And there are men we have never seen who become our friends—poets, novelists, artists, teachers, heroes—these often fall out to the progress of the gospel. They have contributed to the sum of the world's pity, insight, charity, tolerance: they have continued the spirit of the Son of Man. Is it not wonderful and beautiful to think that a sentence from the writings of one who lived, long perhaps before we were born, can kindle light in our minds and shed abroad love and sympathy in our hearts, and so make us friends for ever?

Whatever our experience has been—light or dark, may in the providence of God fall out to the progress of the gospel. We do but see the surface of things. Life is complex, interrelated, intertwined: no man lives or dies to himself. Some of us who think we are doing but little for God may be high up on the list. It is not for us to judge or to be harsh critics of one another. Let us play well our own part.[1]

SECOND SUNDAY AFTER CHRISTMAS.

The Christian Secret of Zest.

'Ye are the salt of the earth; but if the salt have lost his savour, wherewith shall it be salted?'—Mt 5[13].

Dr. L. P. Jacks some time ago wrote an article in which he deplored what he called 'the lost radiance of Christianity.' Is this what Christ means when He speaks of salt which has lost its savour? Let us look into the phrase and see if we can find its meaning.

When we think of the word salt in this connexion, we generally think of its purifying power. It is an antiseptic. It keeps things from going bad; it saves from corruption. That is one of its uses. And we have taken the meaning of Jesus to be that Christians should be a kind of moral antiseptic, keeping the world from rottenness. 'Men must have a religion,' says Carlyle in his caustic way, 'if only to save them the expense of salt.' That is undoubtedly a part of our Lord's meaning, for that is one of the effects of vital Christianity. And surely we may claim that, in this respect, it is working. What would the world be like to-day without the influence of those humble people who, in workshops and homes and offices are radiating the spirit of pure thinking and clean love and sincere goodness, because in their hearts they have enshrined the name of Jesus? They supply the one argument for Christianity which can never be denied—the quality of the Christ-like life.

But that antiseptic quality is not the only value of salt. We use it to give a taste to our food, to stimulate the palate, to give zest to the appetite. Does not this come nearer to what Christ meant when He said, 'Ye are the salt of the earth'? It is our business to carry into the world a zest for life; to give people a relish for existence; to bear about with us the kind of mood and spirit which will make others feel that life is worth while; to break into the world with a tonic quality of spirit which shall banish its dullness and listlessness, and help people to lift up their heads and go on.

---

[1] W. A. Mursell, *Sermons on Special Occasions*, 117.

As Jesus looked round on His world He saw that the besetting trouble with multitudes was their dejection. Life for thousands was deadly dull and uninspiring. It had lost its zest. Nothing new ever freshened the surprise of life. Morning after morning, the sky was grey and cloudy, and the whole air poisoned with weariness. There are countless people like that. Mark Rutherford, in *The Revolution in Tanner's Lane*, describes an old man in the workhouse a century ago. 'He was a poor looking, half-fed creature, with the special workhouse bloodless aspect, just as if he had lived on nothing stronger than gruel and had never smelt fresh air. The old man's face, too, had nothing distinctive in it. He was neither selfish nor generous; neither a liar nor truthful; neither believed anything nor disbelieved anything; was neither good nor bad; had no hope hereafter nor any doubt.' When he was asked about his business, he described how it had slipped through his fingers. 'I was always dull . . .' he said; 'people like to be talked to and I got nothing to talk about, had nothing to say to any of them when they came in. The shop, too, ought to have been painted more often, and I ought to have had something in the window, but, as I say, I was always dull.' That was his whole story. How many people are like that! They have no interest in life, no zest, no heart for its difficulty. No trumpet challenge ever sends its music ringing in their ears. No vision of hope ever kindles their eyes, and so life passes by. They spend their days in a constant state of half-conscious boredom. How much vice or riotous excitement is due to nothing but this dullness! Look at the world to-day, with its shrieking posters, its loud advertisements, its glaring decorations, all making constant appeal to jaded people. What does it speak of but just the dullness of men's lives. It is all an effort to find, outside of us, the source of a joy we cannot find within. The daughter of the late Mrs. W. E. Gladstone wrote of her mother, 'Being so happy, she could afford to be serious.' Unless we have the secret of happiness within we cannot afford to look into the faces of serious things and tackle them, and into the heart of difficulties and meet them. The trouble with many people, in spite of their apparent jollity, is that life at its core is just tasteless and insipid. They have no hope of a future life, because they have no use for this. They have no fear of death, because they have lost the zest for life. They are just dull.

Now the first thing which Christ's disciples did was to banish the dullness of the world in which they lived. Things began to happen when they were about. People began to think and to dispute, they began to curse them, to stone them. Some said they were drunk. Others said they were mad. But, along with that, unhappy people began to find a new spring of joy. A new thrill came into their stagnant blood. New currents of hope were set flowing. With these Christians about, there was a blitheness as of people setting out on a great adventure that started the pulse beating. And when folk asked what it all meant, they discovered that these men had been with Jesus.

What is it in Christianity that awakens the zest of life? In the first place, it gives us the consciousness that there is a big meaning in life. So many people cannot see any meaning at all in it. That is their trouble. They go through it all as if they were dummy figures in some weird and senseless stage play. How can anything have an interest for us if it has no meaning? Some people, of course, never think about life's meaning at all, never ask questions. Some people take up one of the keys to life that lie to their hand and try to use it, and because it does not open all the doors they throw it away and say hard things about life. They try the key called pleasure, and it fits one or two doors, and for a while it seems as if they had found the secret. But, by and by, they come to doors which that key will not open—the door of pain, that of sorrow, and that other of difficulty, and they discover that pleasure cannot be the real meaning of a universe in which these things exist. Some try the key of personal ambition, and there are certain doors seems to fit. Certain difficulties it enables them to overcome, and even turn to their advantage. But let them meet with failure and disappointment, and they discover that, if personal ambition is the meaning of life, the biggest half of experience is for ever an unsolved enigma; for who can get the real heart of love or friendship if they meet it with the demand for pleasure, or seek in it their personal ambition?

It is here that Christianity steps in. Life has a meaning and we have a place in it. The universe is making for something. God has His purpose, and we are called to share it. As we think of that purpose in the light of Jesus Christ it begins to take various shapes, and to glow with a winsome attractiveness. It concerns us personally, for one thing. It includes our character as individuals, the shaping of our mind and spirit, the control of our passions, the bringing to life in us of a spirit like that of Jesus. For that purpose we are called to live, to fight against slackness and discouragement, to stand up to difficulty and opposition and disappointment, and all the other things that once made us feel that life had nothing in it. We are called to a fight. The moment we see that, there is a new interest in life. The essence of all true sport is to pit oneself against another in a struggle that calls out all the mind and the muscle. Only, this fight to which God calls us is not against others, but for them, for an end that we can only achieve together. And Jesus came to people who were down and made them feel that life was a fight—'a real fight,' as Professor James says, 'in which something is won for the universe by our success, or lost by our failure.'

As that purpose throws its light across the world, we see it touching other things, awaking other interests, giving rise to various kinds of social movements. Think of the spirit that started hospitals—that fights with disease and sickness. Think of the struggle against vice and injustice and war—those blots on God's universe. Think of the enterprise for which the Church stands, carrying the light of Christianity into places of ignorance and superstition—the fight that has love behind it.

But, again, Christianity gives zest to life because it has the secret of hope. Life has a meaning, and its meaning for us is a fight. And that fight is a fight which is going to be won. How many people have lost interest because they have lost hope—hope about themselves, hope about the world, hope about the future? We cannot live cheerfully without hope. How many people could get through to-day if there were no to-morrow, and if, somehow, to-morrow did not hold some promise of good? We live by anticipation. Is that an illusion? Some people say it is. Christianity says it is not, provided that our hearts are set on the right things. 'Hope,' said Paul, 'maketh not ashamed.' It is no illusion if it is born of the love of Christ. The fight for character, in the long run, is a winning battle. It is the same with the fight for righteousness; it is a winning battle, if you look far enough ahead. Or think of the assurance of immortality. How many people are hopeless about life just because they have lost hope in the future? We need to reach out to the horizons of Jesus. That was one of the first points of the Christian offensive upon the degradation of life in the early days—its attack upon death, with its walls of savage despair. Life began to be filled with a splendid optimism for the men who had seen Jesus. They could go on without fear. Pain was nothing. Trouble was a passing cloud. Life was a splendid gift. The whole perspective was changed because they had a background to this present world. All they had to do and to face was a task from God, a trust to keep, a post to hold, a fight to win, and some day they would take it all and lay it down in triumph before the Great White Throne. The reason why life has lost its zest for many people to-day is because their world is not big enough for them to find God in it. Let us find the perspective of Jesus, where an act of kindness has 'cosmic importance,' where our words and deeds, whether good or evil, are shaping destiny and registering themselves somewhere, for good or ill, upon the movement of God's purpose. Let us see life with the eyes of Jesus.[1]

First Sunday after Epiphany.

The Quest for God.

'And, lo, the star, which they saw in the east, went before them, till it came and stood over where the young child was.'—Mt 2^{9}.

The Epiphany story is the story of a quest, a journey, and a discovery. There are those who wave it aside with a contemptuous hand and mutter 'fairy tale.' It is easy to understand perplexity in a reader who studies it reverently and strives to do justice alike to the historical and the symbolic elements in it without feeling able to decide how much is poetry and how much plain matter of fact. But the man who sees neither history nor poetry in it, and nothing else but fantasy, is stone-blind. It brims over with spiritual meaning, and its message gleams on St. Matthew's page. Wise men out of the East guided by a star on their long journey, consulting the orthodox religious leaders of Jerusalem about their object and their destination, and pressing on to the end and arriving at their goal by the manger of the new-born Jesus—of these facts which are the essence of the story there is no reason to question the literal historical truth. The guiding star may or may not have been connected with some rare conjunction of planets which astronomers declare to have occurred at a date which would fit in with the facts of the narrative. All this matters little or nothing to the message of the story, which stands out in the Nativity records with a symbolic suggestion of much more than first meets the eye. This is no mere legend, thrust into the preface of the human life of Jesus to strengthen the impression of His supernatural origin. It is spiritually at one with the life that followed, and it strikes notes which we can hear all through the gospel accounts of Jesus.

---

[1] J. Reid, *In Touch with Christ*, 216.

No wonder Christian art has always loved the Epiphany and has poured out all the wealth and the devotion of genius in depicting it. In the age of persecution we find it frequently in the Catacombs, where no symbolic picture is more popular than the Adoration of the Infant Jesus by the Three Kings. In mediæval times the great masters vied with one another in their treatment of it. Miracle plays and carols made it one of their chief themes. And we to-day, whose sense of reality is increasingly alive to the fact that all truth does not begin and end with scientific inquiry into physical facts, can see in it as much as those who have gone before us. For it is one of those Christian things that come right home to our sense of the need of God, and to the quest for God which is going on within and around us. Where is He, the King of life, who knows its secrets and will show us His way?

The tale of a quest. Some men are never tired of saying that religion has had its day. During the Great War Mr. Arnold Bennett committed himself to a prophecy that, whatever else was doubtful about the effects of the War, this at least was certain that it would destroy Christianity. He has since proved in a paper on 'My Religion' that he has little or no knowledge of what Christianity really is. His prophecy, of course, has proved to be false; Christianity is as alive as ever it was, speaking its message and weaving itself round the hearts of men.

Paul, in Sir Philip Gibbs's *The Unchanging Quest*, says, 'I'm trying to get the hang of it, to worry my way through to some kind of faith. It's perfectly clear to me that without religion the human race is doomed. We've lost all our bearings. We've nothing to hold on to. There's no explanation of life. . . . If I could believe in God I'd have more faith in man. . . . Anyhow, I am not satisfied with scepticism.' Such seekers are bound to arrive, and on the last page of the novel we find him saying, 'I'm getting near the end of my quest—God.'

If a man travels, he always finds that he is not left without a guiding star. The wise men of the Epiphany were probably the ancestors of the modern Parsees, whose faith comes nearer than any other non-Christian religion to the teaching of Jesus. They held strange beliefs about the stars and their connexion with the lives of men which are utterly incredible to us. But they looked for a coming Lord, who would solve the problem of life more fully than they could, and they went out in search of Him when they thought the hour of His coming had arrived. They believed and acted upon that belief, and God led them into a fuller light.

Every life has God's star of Epiphany above it. 'God,' says Chrysostom, 'caught the Magi with a star, and the fishermen with their fish.' 'God,' says Emerson, 'enters by a private door into each individual.' Centuries apart in time, these two very different teachers see the same fact.

The real trouble with many who seem to be starless is that they will not persevere, or even enter on any real quest. One of our leading publicists, who is no mere pessimist, says that the greatest obstacle to the industrial and financial recovery of the nation is the all-absorbing preoccupation of people of all classes with their own enjoyment. They spend their money, he says, on immediate gratification with no notion of applying it to anything but personal consumption. The pursuit of pleasure and play stifles enterprise and blinds them to the necessity of hard work. How can a nation dominated by such ideals, or the lack of anything that can be dignified with the name of ideals, hope to meet and overcome our post-war difficulties? Now if that is true, as it certainly is, of economic recovery, it is equally true from the spiritual standpoint. The quest for truth, the search for God, is not a matter that can be toyed with and treated as a hobby or an aside from the main business of life.

One of the greatest scenes in our modern drama is the scene in Mr. Bernard Shaw's *St. Joan*, after the coronation in the cathedral at Rheims. Joan tells the king and the archbishop and the others around her that her voices are bidding her to lead them on to a complete victory, and that she is sure that, if only they will persevere, the issue will prove that she is not mistaken. And Charles, the preposterous king, bleats out: 'O, your voices, your voices! Why don't the voices come to me? I am King, not you.' As if such voices could be regarded as a perquisite of his paltry kingship! And Joan replies: 'They do come to you; but you do not hear them. You have not sat in the field in the evening listening for them. When the angelus rings you cross yourself and have done with it; but if you prayed from your heart, and listened to the thrilling of the bells in the air after they stop ringing, you would hear the voices as well as I do.'

Lack of serious purpose utterly paralyses the stirrings of the spiritual life within. And there is another thing which is equally fatal to those who seek awhile, but break off the quest. One of the features in the Epiphany drama which mediæval art delighted to dwell upon was the contrast between the pomp and magnificence of the three kings and the poverty and humility of the Holy Family and its surroundings—the penthouse, the manger, and the cattle standing by. The description of the wise men as wealthy kings is probably legendary in origin. But it helps to emphasize the crucial thing in the story, the discovery of the seekers that the end of their long quest is a simple Babe in a manger without any of the adornments that give prestige to human greatness or win human submission.

A young German writing recently about religion asks, 'Is it possible that the humble, contrite attitude of prayer can be postulated for the white races with their scientific conquests? . . . No! That would mean the surrender of bodily good for the sake of the spirit, a rejection of firm reality for shadowy soul-values, the vanishing of this world in an Eden-dream.' There is in this young German's sentences the muttering of the spirit of Herod, who is the impersonation of the spirit of anti-Christ in the Epiphany story. If it is 'the firm reality of bodily good' that men are seeking beyond everything else, they will never see anything revealing in Jesus. Pride of power, greed of possession, arrogance of knowledge, all these miss the way to the manger, which is the way to God. It is too simple and too plain.

Step softly, under snow or rain,
  To find the place where men can pray;
The way is all so very plain
  That we may lose the way. . . .
Go humbly; humble are the skies,
  And low and large and fierce the Star;
So very near the manger lies
  That we may travel far.

But the crown of the Epiphany story is that there was then, and that there always is, a manifestation of God to souls that seek, of all types, of all races, of all times. 'They came into the house, and fell down and worshipped him.'

There is an end to the quest, an end which is also a beginning; and the end is finding God in the Incarnate Christ.[1]

---

[1] F. B. Macnutt, *From Chaos to God*, 26.

Contributions and Comments.

The Rich Young Ruler and St. Paul.

Will you allow me a few comments on your exposition of Mr. Moxon's 'fascinating article' on the above? And first I would refer to the article in The Expository Times of November 1927, where it was pointed out that Prebendary Webb Peploe twenty years ago put forward the same theory, also another idea that St. John, Lazarus, and the Ruler were one and the same! Further, a very ingenious theory that he was St. Barnabas!

Putting aside the conjecture about St. Paul being rich, Mr. Moxon says (1) the call to the ruler was a call to apostleship (*i.e.* like St. Paul's). May I point out that our Lord had already called and appointed His chosen Twelve (a sacred number)? They had been under training for some time. The call to the Ruler was not long before the Passion. If it had been accepted, there would have been thirteen apostles, a most unlikely thing. I submit, therefore, the call was not to apostleship but to discipleship, the same kind as to many others in general.

(2) The rich young man was a ruler (*archōn*, St. Luke says), usually held to be of a synagogue of which there was a very great number. It has never been held (so far as I know) that St. Paul was such a ruler. He may possibly have been a member of the Sanhedrin. He said that when Christians were put to death he gave his 'vote' against them; but was a member of the Sanhedrin called a ruler also? I cannot find any authority for it, nor yet for the statement that a ruler means a 'prominent young member of the Pharisees.'

(3) The claim of St. Paul to be an apostle because he had been called as the rich ruler seems to me to be most unreal and incongruous. For the call was

refused and rejected, and the ruler went away. If he was really Saul or Paul, is it conceivable that he would boldly claim, 'Am I not an Apostle? Have not I seen the Lord?' if that was the way he had seen Him—to reject Him! Surely this is, as Mr. Moxon says, a pretty thin claim!

(4) St. Luke records the story. He was the companion and intimate friend of St. Paul, and the writer of the Acts with the thrice told story of the Conversion. Is it conceivable that so honest and self-condemnatory a man as St. Paul was, concealed the story from him, or that so well known a man as a ruler was not identified, or, again, that he, being the centre of such a touching story (related by three evangelists)—our Lord, looking upon and loving him—could have persecuted and condemned to death the disciples of the Lord? It gives one a very unpleasant idea of the great Apostle, and, so far from being a fascinating theory, only tends to disturb the sublime tragedy of the 'Great Refusal' which three of the Gospels have chosen to leave as we have it—a refusal that was never recalled.

JAMES WILLIAMS.

Herodsfoot Vicarage, Cornwall.

Judges v. 8.

THIS verse is the most difficult in a chapter which has suffered considerably in transmission. In 5^{8b} the late Dr. Burney proposed אֻזְלוּ חֲמֻשִׁים מֵצִיר, but v.^{8a} is still unsatisfactory. Read therefore יְמַהֲרוּ אֵלֶיהָ מַחֲרִשִׁים, 'they hastened to her secretly.' The story of the gathering of the tribes now is as follows. All communications ceased till Deborah arose. Then armed men came out from the cities, hurried to her secretly, and not a shield or a javelin was seen among them all. They hid their arms, because their only hope of success was in complete secrecy. The difficulty of Burney's translation is that they were armed, for in spite of his reading in 5^{8b}, he appears to interpret 5^{8c} to mean that no Israelite was armed. They had arms, but they concealed them. The account of the subsequent battle confirms the impression of the secrecy of the gathering which the present emendation emphasizes. The enemy were thrown into confusion at the sudden onset of such an unexpected force, and made little attempt to withstand the charge.

For מחרשם, compare chiefly 2 S 19^{11}. Von Gumpach, Marquart, and Burney have already proposed חרשים. The reading now proposed involves מה for נח, but otherwise simply a regrouping of the consonants.

NORMAN SNAITH.

Felling-on-Tyne.

How Joab took Jerusalem.

AN UNWRITTEN CHAPTER IN ISRAEL'S MILITARY HISTORY.

LET us, first, reconnoitre the position. David had been anointed king over all Israel at Hebron, where he was with his army. He saw that there could be no security for the union of the north and south so long as Jerusalem was in hostile hands. It lay like a high, strong barrier between the southern and northern tribes. He saw too that the fortress city on the heights would be an ideal capital for the united kingdom—for military, administrative, and religious purposes. It was probably not a large city at the time, but it was necessary for him to possess it, and, were it in his hands, would be invaluable.

But how to achieve the capture of it? It was well-nigh impregnable, and was regarded by its inhabitants as altogether so. On three sides it was naturally guarded by steep descents—on the west by what is now the Wady-er-Rababi; on the south by the valley of Hinnom, with the lateral valley of the Tyropœon; on the east, just under the wall, by the deep valley of the Kidron, where was the pool of Gihon, now called the Virgin's Spring, the only known spring of the district. But probably in David's time the Kidron was a watercourse from its source to the sea—the Dead Sea. Jerusalem stood about 2500 feet above the Mediterranean, while the Dead Sea, about 15 miles away, was about 1350 feet below the Mediterranean. On the side of the watercourse, then, the cliff was precipitous. It was vulnerable only on the north side, and here it was well fortified. When David and his army made a reconnaissance, the Jebusites taunted him that the blind and the lame could hold it against him (2 S 5^{6-8} and 1 Ch 11^{5-8}).

The text is somewhat complicated, but the meaning seems fairly evident. David's plan was to attack on the impossible side, like Wolfe later at Quebec. In the council of war, when back at Hebron, he said, 'Whoso smiteth the Jebusites, let him get up to the watercourse, and let him smite the blind and the lame,' for the taunt had stung the soul of David. He also promised that the man who did it should be chief and captain of the army.

'Let him get up *to* the watercourse' is rather indistinct and tame. Whereas if it might read, 'Let him go up *by* the watercourse'—and the prefix can be translated by 'by' equally as well as by 'to'—life comes into it, and we have an unwritten military achievement of Joab of the highest value. The word concerned is בַּצִּנּוֹר (*batsinnôr*) (2 S 5^{8}), and is translated 'watercourse.' The dictionary gives the meaning 'conduit, canal, waterfall.' If one may hazard the suggestion, let the word be בָּצוּר, (*bātsûr*), a similar-looking word, whose meaning is 'steep, precipitous, inaccessible, impregnable.' *In either case*, we have Joab and his men creeping up, probably by night, climbing the escarpment and the low wall at the top, falling upon the few sentinels (if there were any at all), who never expected an assault from that quarter, and capturing the city.

Confessedly the text is entangled, but if one knot can be untied, we have a loosening of the whole. By untying it, a bold and successful exploit by the very able captain Joab is brought to light.

'And David dwelt in the stronghold; therefore they called it the city of David.'

James Feather.

St. Helens, Hastings.

John iv. 34-42.

There is so much that is stimulating in Mr. Macgregor's recent 'Moffatt' Commentary on St. John that one is diffident in suggesting improvements. Yet his treatment of this passage is not satisfying. To be able to drop the difficult vv.$^{37f.}$ into a sub-Apostolic *oubliette* seems suspiciously too convenient (p. 112).

The word λόγος, (v.^{37}) appears to offer a key to the unity of the passage. τούτῳ, as Mr. Macgregor remarks, refers to what follows, but surely ὁ λόγος looks back to the 'saying' of v.^{35}. ἐν τούτῳ, then, may mean 'in this way' or 'to this extent.' 'The saying' (about the interval between seed-time and harvest) 'is appropriate to this extent that sower and reaper are two different people.' Of course 'one soweth and another reapeth' was a common proverbial phrase (cf. Macgregor, p. 112 foot), but it is here only incidentally cited in comment on the previous quotation.

The structure of v.^{38} with its emphatic ἐγώ and ὑμᾶς indicates a deliberate and relevant utterance. 'I, for example, sent you to get in what had certainly cost industry but not yours; others have toiled, and you have entered upon their industry.' It is in full accordance with the Synoptic account of Jesus for Him to draw His illustration from so homely a circumstance as the buying of food (taking θερίζειν as in English, 'to get in the harvest,' 'to get in provisions'). No doubt the Church has always valued the words for their higher meaning, but it is very probable that Jesus Himself used them first in this literal sense in order to point His assertion that the sower is one person and the reaper another. (I see that Dr. Brooke in Peake's *Com.*, p. 750*a*, has also taken θερίζειν in this way.) It is then unnecessary to relegate v.^{38} to early in the second century; rather it may be added to our all too scanty store of picturesque sayings of the Lord.

But if the passage is a unity, the assertion in v.^{37} must be given its full value. That is to say that Jesus cannot be regarded as both Sower and Reaper, for He affirms with emphasis that they are different persons. He mentions the proverb, 'Four months, then harvest,' in contrast to the case of His own work where the ingathering is immediate, with no interval of waiting. But although disproved in this respect the saying stands true in a general way, because even in His abnormal instance it is another who brings home the harvest. He is not declaring that no one ever reaps of his own sowing, any more than the current proverb (v.^{37}) entirely disallows exceptions. He merely says that His own case, in this respect, stands on the side of the common rule, and not against it. Then follows His simple example from the food which He had just sent His disciples to buy.

While, therefore, the Sower is undoubtedly Jesus Himself, the reaper is surely the woman, who is already at work and receiving credit (μισθόν) as the evangelist, the bringer of good news. But the more discerning of those Samaritans who came to Jesus recognized that the power and influence were in Him, and that they owed nothing to the woman beyond their 'ingathering.' It is Jesus the Sower who by His patient husbandry has brought the crop to maturity (cf. τελειώσω, v.^{34}).

The result of this inquiry is to confirm the impression that the entire incident is substantially a matter of fact. However vv.$^{35-38}$ may have been interpreted by later reflection, they have an immediate and pertinent bearing within the narrative, and make for completeness and effectiveness.

It may be added that, although the 'proverbial' view of *τετράμηνος* (v.[35]) has here been adopted, the above interpretation is unaffected if we render, 'Is it not you who are saying, "Four months from now, and then harvest"?' It is still possible to refer ὁ λόγος (v.[37]) to 'what you say.' But it raises the chronological difficulty, which lies beyond the scope of this note. Leslie H. Bunn.

Louth, Lincolnshire.

Isaiah xiv. 19.

The emendation of this verse proposed in the November 1928 issue of The Expository Times (p. 93), although ingenious, has its weak point in the fact that a branch be it abominable or broken does not well fit into the following 'clothed with the slain' (R.V.). I therefore suggest to read נֶשֶׁר instead of נֵצֶר. The eagle, as Lv 11[13], Dt 14[12] show, ranges among the fowls to be had in abomination, and is at the same time an excellent simile of the king of Babylon who said in his heart: 'I will ascend into heaven' (Is 14[13]). This emendation is such a slight one that one wonders why nobody has thought of it before. As far as I know from Professor Kittel, to whom I communicated this emendation some months ago, it will be noticed in the forthcoming edition of his Bible.

Ludwig Köhler.

Zürich, Switzerland.

Entre Nous.

Selma Lagerlöf's 'Jerusalem.'

If you ask any educated Swede to-day to name the six greatest names among his countrymen, he will almost invariably begin with Gustavus Adolphus and end with Selma Lagerlöf. So far she is the only woman who holds the Nobel Prize for Literature. In awarding this prize the Swedish Academy declared they did so 'for reason of the noble idealism, the wealth of imagination, the soulful quality of style, which characterise her works.' A study of one of her books alone, her—in this country too little appreciated—*Jerusalem*, leaves one in no doubt as to her right to sit there among the immortals.

To begin with, if you wish to give a Nobel prize to the greatest living novelist, how few names there are from which to choose. Great writers, indeed, in plenty, but great novelists . . . ? For if there is one thing required of a novelist it is that he should take cognizance of the whole of life as it is normally experienced by men and women. And if any part of the normal experience is out of the book, the loss to the characters in the book must be depicted. If we do not see the sunlight we must see the shadows; if there is darkness we must be made conscious that the light has been obscured: if men and women are not fed, we must see them hungry; if they are dead, their author dare not pretend that they are alive. A novelist has to depict, not puppets, but men and women, moving about in worlds not realized, an ascending race, dying to the past, conflicting with the present, reaching out towards that which is to come. And that is what Selma Lagerlöf succeeds in doing. That is one reason why she is a very great novelist, that, rather than what so many critics call her romanticism. For we are accustomed to contrast realism and romanticism in fiction, and to divide writers into one or other group. But what after all are both realism and romanticism but exclusive aspects of life: the realist writer attempts to depict material aspects of life apart from the interpreting spirit of man; the romanticist, to depict the spirit of man undisciplined by the conditions of mortality. And we have had such an eruption of clever realist fiction that when we at last get something larger and more spacious, we are apt to say it is good because it is romantic, instead of saying, as we should, that it is good because it is a picture, an interpretation, of life. 'Reading Selma Lagerlöf,' says the Swedish composer, Hugo Alfven, 'is like sitting in the dusk of a Spanish cathedral . . . afterwards one does not know whether what he has seen was dream or reality, but certainly he has been on holy ground.'

Jerusalem is a noble book. Under the mantle of these simple tales of the peasant aristocrats of Dalecarlia lie hidden spiritual meanings, 'truth hidden under beauteous fiction.' There is a literal pilgrimage to Jerusalem in the final section of the book, and the story of it is based upon a historic event of last century. But in every preceding section of the book, within the masterly picture of the outward events which lead up to this pilgrimage, there are other movements made visible. Jerusalem beckons, not only to the community, but to individual souls: it comes down out of heaven from God, and enters into one simple heart after another, bringing pain and conflict and redemption.

But it is no cheap and obvious conflict we see depicted on those pages, between material and spiritual values. The fiercest battle is set, as in real life, between opposing spiritual forces. And always the moral issues are decided, not by any standardized code of conduct, but by the relationship of the choice to a personal, individual vision of the City of God. Almost, one might say, the choice is to be judged not so much by virtue of what is chosen, as by virtue of the degree of moral tension at which the choice is made. One soul may find Jerusalem through the renunciation of marriage, another through the renunciation of all that stands between himself and human love; one through loyalty to home, another through forsaking home; but all, only as they follow the gleam. Yet even on these heights of experience, indeed especially there, we are surprised again and again by the tinkle of cherubic laughter and the flash of mischievous wings. The Swedish critic, Oscar Levertin, says that Selma Lagerlöf 'has the eyes of a child, and the heart of a child.' She resembles, indeed, at times, one of those unfathomable little beings which Raphael has poised upon the bars of heaven beneath his divinest Madonna's feet, gently educating the orthodox towards the conception of a Royalty which can be amused.

But fundamentally the book is an excellent story. Great novels always are. We must proceed, as old Aristotle says, from that which we know better to that which we know not so well. First, we have the literal edifice duly and decoratively built together, then we are at liberty to discern the hidden truth. Selma Lagerlöf's literal edifice is masterly. Not for one moment does she turn aside from building that edifice till all is complete. It is a story she is writing, not a sermon, not a psychological treatise. But when she has finished the miracle has happened. Even as the black letters she has written upon white paper have summoned up those bright images of forest and river and farmhouse, of peasant youths and maidens, and toilworn fathers and mothers, so those pictures in their turn, so meticulously external and non-moralized, summon up before our inward eye a vision of spiritual conflicts and of pilgrimages of the soul, a vision which lingers on long after the literal tale is forgotten.

'The ways of Providence cannot be reasoned out by the finite mind. I cannot fathom them, yet seeking to know them is the most satisfying thing in all the world.' SELMA LAGERLÖF.

The Redemption of Christmas.

'A little child . . . in the midst of them.'—Mt 18².

'A talk about Christmas! So that when you are wishing "A Merry Christmas," or "A Happy Christmas," you will not be using just worn and empty words, but you will be putting a great and splendid meaning in them. We are apt to think that Christmas was one of the things that began when people stopped writing B.C. and began writing A.D.; but our Christian Christmas did not begin till a very long time after Christ was born at Bethlehem; and long, long before He was born, people made merry at the time of the year we call Christmas.

'The last week of December is the time when the sun is farthest from the earth. Since midsummer the distance has been growing greater and greater. And now winter has come when the day is dark in the afternoon, and the trees are bare and the flowers are dead. It is mid-winter. It is called the winter "solstice," the time when the sun seems to stand still for a space and then begins to come nearer to the earth again.

'Therefore people made it an occasion of rejoicing, and because the worship of the sun, which gives life and health to the world, is the oldest of all religions, it became a festival in honour of the sun-god.

'In the Norse countries they called it "Yule," which is "wheel," and means that the wheel of the year is turning from winter to summer. With great rejoicings and singing of songs, they brought in the yule-log and kindled it in honour of the sun.

'In Britain the Druids led the people out into the forests to cut the mistletoe with silver sickles.

'In Rome they worshipped the sun under the name of Saturn, and the festival was called the "Saturnalia." People sent presents to each other. They feasted and made merry. Slaves were free for the day and sat in their master's seats, and their masters waited on them and served them. Everything was topsy-turvy in a sort of mad, good-natured revel. They sang coarse songs, disguised themselves and acted nonsensical plays, dressed their homes with evergreens, and made merry.

And because Rome, and Norway, and Britain all flowed together to make our nation, all three customs came floating into our life from their far sources, so that mistletoe and holly and the yule-log, presents and songs, guisards and paper caps in crackers, and Christmas dinners all tell us where we have come from.

'Now after the old Roman world became Christian people went on keeping the Saturnalia, and although many of the songs they sang and many of the things they did were shameful and unseemly, they clung to the old customs and would not give them up. So wise Christian teachers said, "We must make this into a Christian festival. We'll gather all this rejoicing round the Birth of our Saviour, and that will put a soul into it." And so they did, and it was much better than preaching against it. Just as Jesus once put a child in the midst of His quarrelling disciples, and it made them ashamed of quarrelling, so the child Jesus in the midst of the December festival and all its coarseness, changed it into the Christian Christmas. They sang carols about the birth of Jesus, and these were so pure that the old, ugly, impure songs just disappeared. They acted plays about the shepherds and the angels, and the cradle that was a manger, and the old plays were soon forgotten. They kept all the good-nature, and the kindliness and the giving of presents to friends and gifts to the poor, but these had a new reason now—it was the birthday of Jesus they were keeping. It was the gladdest time of the year, and all were friends, not because the sun was then coming back, but because the Son of God, who is the Light of the World and the Giver of Life Eternal, came to earth then for our salvation, to bring back the summer of God's peace.

'Some people used to think that we ought not to keep Christmas, because once it was a heathen festival, but that is all the more reason to keep it; for it is one of the things the Spirit of Jesus has redeemed. It tells us that He is the Redeemer.

'It is a picture of what Jesus is doing for the world. It is a picture of what He can do to you and me: chase away the evil, and make kindness more kind and more beautiful because it is done for Christ's sake.

'We are glad, and we have good reason to be glad, then; to wish each other "A Happy Christmas," and to dream the great dream of the time when, not for one day only shall there be "peace on earth and goodwill towards men," but all the year round and over the whole earth.'

Probably you have recognized the writer of this children's address, for he is well known to all readers of THE EXPOSITORY TIMES—the Rev. Stuart Robertson. He has published this month a new collection with the title *Tigers' Teeth* (Hodder & Stoughton; 5s. net). A few of the addresses have already appeared in this magazine, but the bulk of them are new. Mr. Robertson has the gift *par excellence* of speaking to children, and we predict that this book will be much sought after.

Influence.

'In a book called *More Reminiscences of an Old Bohemian*, by Major Fitzroy Gardner, who must have been one of the casual acquaintances who come and go and bring their generous appreciation with them, he speaks of my mother (Alice Meynell) as "no ordinary highbrow, but a very beautiful woman whose presence, as much as her writing, was an inspiration. . . . She had the face of an angel and alas! a far too frail physique. . . . She possessed an instinctively gracious dignity of manner, yet the sense of humour of a frivolous girl. Almost all her guests whom one first met on those delightful occasions one desired to meet again. I remember one Sunday evening, coming out of the house by chance with a woman of the world, more distinguished for her physical charm than for intellect. As we walked towards the Bayswater Road, talking about our hostess as if she had been some minor deity, my companion suddenly remarked, 'I feel somehow as if I must go to church and pray.'"'[1]

[1] Viola Meynell, *Alice Meynell*, 144.

Printed by MORRISON & GIBB LIMITED, Tanfield Works, and Published by T. & T. CLARK, 38 George Street, Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to THE EDITOR, Kings Gate, Aberdeen, Scotland.

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

Karl Barth utters a passionate appeal to preachers and teachers to pass beyond questions of criticism and give their strength to expounding the special content of the Bible, 'the remarkable *something* with which the writers of these stories and those who stood behind them were concerned, the Biblical *content*.' As if in answer to that appeal one of the greatest Biblical critics of our time, Dr. James Moffatt, has given us a magnificent exposition of New Testament truth.

He has chosen for his theme *Love in the New Testament* (Hodder & Stoughton; 10s. 6d. net). We are all agreed that Christianity is a religion of love. What do we mean by that, and what is the evidence of the New Testament? These questions Dr. Moffatt has set himself to answer, and his answer is a monument of learning.

Dr. Moffatt considers it 'timely to readjust our estimate of Christian love by examining the classical standards as presented in the New Testament literature.' And that for two reasons. '(*a*) Some detach "God is love" from the context, and regard this either as the statement of a cosmic principle or as a complete definition of Christianity in itself. . . . (*b*) There is a tendency to isolate brotherly love and to concentrate upon that as the essence of Christianity, as though the ethical message could be detached from the religious basis with which it is organically connected in the New Testament.' As men in previous times were preoccupied with the truth of the sovereignty of God and deduced from it what seemed to them to be logical conclusions as to the nature of the Divine decrees, so the Christian mind of to-day has laid hold on the truth of the love of God and has proceeded to draw deductions from it without due regard to the teaching of the New Testament. Hasty generalizations, such as that God is the Father of all men by virtue of His creatorship, that all men are His sons, that all have a natural claim upon His love, and that His love will infallibly assure the salvation of all, are preached to-day as if they were beyond question the very essence of the Christian faith. Those who hold views of this type will find in Dr. Moffatt's exposition much that is striking, not to say startling.

The subject is treated under the three heads of the love of God to man, the love of man to God, and to his fellow-men. Under each head there is a most careful and thorough study of the teaching of Jesus, of Paul, of John, and of the Primitive Church. It may be said without fear of contradiction that we have here the most complete and scholarly treatment of this sublime theme which has appeared in modern times. It is impossible even to hint at the treasures of exegesis here contained, and the finely minute studies of New Testament synonyms and idioms. We can only outline some of the main conclusions, leaving the evidence to be sought for in the work itself, which should find a place in every preacher's library.

Dealing with God's love to man, 'one of the most surprising results yielded by any close examination of Christianity as revealed in the New Testament literature is that apart from the redeeming action of the Lord Jesus Christ the early Church evidently saw no ground whatever for believing in a God of love.' In his great statement that 'God is love,' 'John is not thinking of a pervasive love-principle in the universe. . . . For John the revelation of God as Love is not an intuition or obvious inference from observation of the organic universe; it is only evident to those who see God acting in Jesus Christ's person and mission.' Speaking of those who 'dilute and dissipate the love of God into a vague sentiment about God as the Father of men because He is their Creator,' Dr. Moffatt adds, 'For this, the New Testament offers no encouragement whatever.' Again, 'God is for Jesus the Father of those who share His fellowship, not of all men generally. . . . Membership in this group is indeed open to all; this is the invariable conviction of the New Testament, which is implicit in the teaching of Jesus Himself, and in this sense the fatherliness of God for all men may be held; but nowhere is there any trace of the idea that all men by birth are, as such, sons of God or brothers one of another in the full sense of these terms.' The love and grace of God to men are overflowingly revealed in the New Testament, but the God whom Jesus preached 'was not a *bon Dieu,* genially tolerant of distinctions between truth and falsehood or between right and wrong, but a God whose love embraced moral severity and justice. . . . "There is nothing inexorable but love," as Carlyle once said, and the moral demands of God as revealed by the synoptic Jesus are searching and stringent. This relation of men to Him is crucial. Under His order of Providence, men may do certain things which will undo them; such was the stern truth which Jesus taught.'

Dealing with man's love to God, Dr. Moffatt points out that 'there is no reference in the New Testament to the idea that God is to be loved as our Maker and Creator,' and where love to God our Saviour is mentioned it is

Love that breathes not without awe,
Love that adores, but on the knees of prayer.

'Christ is not, for Paul, "my Beloved." It was not that he lacked a passionate devotion to his Master. But he generally chose to say, "I am His δοῦλος, His devoted servant." No one valued more highly than he did the freedom of sonship which faith brought, the sense of being within the household of God the Father. But still he said, δοῦλος. He never called Jesus even his Elder Brother; once he described Him indeed as *the first-born among many brothers,* but this was from the standpoint of the Divine purpose. Jesus drew out His love in trust and service and obedience. . . . It is significant that the term *beloved* is used by Paul about his fellow-Christians, not about Christ—a usage generally reversed in the religious world of to-day. While Jesus Christ inspired primitive Christians with far more than mere awe or reverence, at the same time their love and devotion were charged with a sense of Him as their lord (κύριος), which imposed an instinctive check upon the use of ordinary love-language.'

Again, man's love to his fellow-men was no mere sentiment but a steadfast will-to-good, which covered all the ethical relationships of life. It expresses itself in various shades of meaning, 'from the heroic form in which it inspires self-sacrifice for one's fellows, to the not less trying duty of forgiving injuries; from the thoughtful affection which avoids harshness and selfishness, or which under the strain of intercourse refuses to lose its temper, to the patient effort after good-nature and generosity even to the surly and malicious at one's side.' Philanthropy, however, is no substitute for religion. 'The idea of unselfish, devoted love to one's fellows being enough as a religion does not seem to have occurred to any writer in the New Testament. . . . They shrank in horror from any view of religion which undervalued belief. From that they recoiled, as though it non-suited faith. Religion was to speak *de Deo,* or it was nothing. . . . The source of love as well as the standard of it was sought and found in what the Church owed to God who had drawn near to their life in Jesus Christ.'

To sum up, love as declared in the New Testament is absolutely Christo-centric, revealed, confirmed, and communicated by the Divine will acting in history and expressing itself in the gift of God's Son to be the Saviour of the world. 'Hedonists and humanitarians have claimed in their respective fashions that "love is God, or god," avowing that this love is the one thing in the wide world which they are prepared to label as divine. But Christians in the first generation had not so learned their lesson. . . . According to the New Testament the Church began (and if it fails to continue this, it will soon end) by confessing God is love, but only in the spirit of adoring reverence which inspired the song of praise to *Him who loves us, and has loosed us from our sins by shedding His own blood . . . to Him be glory and dominion for ever and ever: Amen.*'

There will always be a welcome among modern men, at any rate among modern religious men, for any earnest and competent discussion of the Christian Faith in the light of the problems that have been pressed upon it from the side of science and, in general, from those subtle influences which constitute the intellectual atmosphere of our time. The days are gone for ever when the confident appeal, which used to be, and still is, made to the Bible by the unreflecting Christian man, can be permitted to ignore the trend of contemporary thinking in the realms of science and philosophy. The thoughtful Christian owes it to-day, as he has always owed it, alike to himself and to the faith which he holds, to find a place for it in the intellectual world in which it has pleased God to place him. We are living in the twentieth century, and it is to the thought and the movements of our own century that we have to relate our religious thinking, if we hope to commend our Christian faith to the men who are saturated with that thought and immersed in those movements.

Real help towards this much needed reconciliation will be found in Archbishop Charles F. D'ARCY's book on *The Christian Outlook in the Modern World* (Hodder & Stoughton; 6s. net). Its sub-title is 'The Amazing Pageant of Creation and History as understood by Faith and Science,' and it may be fairly described as a sane, courageous, and not unsuccessful attempt to defend the Christian faith, or at least the Christian outlook, in view of the staggering immensity and complexity of the world into which we are introduced by the representatives of the modern sciences. Indeed, it is much more than this, for it discusses such questions as the problem of evil, immortality, the Trinity, prayer, and sacrament.

The Archbishop would of course be the last to expect that every one will accept without challenge all the conclusions to which he has come: he is too well aware of the difficulties which beset the discussion on the right hand and on the left. He knows that there are many good Christians who do not entirely share his own generous faith that 'the all-embracing love of God will finally break down all opposing barriers of hardened evil.' The human will has the sombre and mysterious power of resisting and rejecting what it knows to be good, and who can say for certain that in the end it will inevitably suffer itself to be won even by the coercion of the Divine love? But, after all, Dr. D'ARCY's book is concerned rather with an 'outlook' than with dogmatic affirmations, and he will doubtless be content if he can persuade others to share his own attractive outlook.

Among other things he offers some incidental remarks, which are steadying and refreshing, on the ever-present subject of miracles. What place can there be for them within a system instinct with law and order, a system which seems to present inexorable sequences of cause and effect? He points out that man himself, assuming the fundamental reliability of the universe, can produce effects which would once have been called miraculous, by his increasing knowledge of and consequent control of natural forces; and he suggests that, while man's control of these forces is on the surface of things, God's is from the centre: He is 'the inner life of all'; and therefore 'at great turning-points of human history, when the mind of man has need to be awakened to the reality of the spiritual,' it is not unreasonable to suppose that unusual events occur. There are minds to which this solution of the problem will not be entirely satisfactory, but even for them it may have its own element of suggestiveness.

For it is hardly to be supposed that the universe is without a purpose; and if behind it there is a Mind, as there surely must be, of inconceivable Majesty, is there any absurdity in supposing that that Mind, with its infinite resources, may direct, as man himself can, the forces at its disposal and make them contributory to its purpose? With the purpose, as such, science has nothing to do; science has to do with the links in the chain, religion with the meaning of the whole. The universe is a great adventure; man, as all literature testifies, is the immemorial adventurer, and God is happily characterized by Dr. D'Arcy as the Supreme Adventurer. If we think of Him thus, 'we must regard Him as one who, permitting the physical forces of the world to work themselves out to the full, and entrusting His creatures of higher order with moral attributes, so as to fit them to share with Himself the vast adventure of the ages, relies solely upon moral forces to gain the victory.'

The book teaches us to look with wonder and gratitude upon the inconceivably magnificent pageant which has been unfolding throughout the millions of years before the dawn of human history, and moving through historic time with an even more impressive majesty, as the meaning and drift of that purpose come to ever clearer expression. Dr. D'Arcy is not only not afraid of evolution, he rejoices in it; so far is he from fearing that the account of human origins as given by science detracts from the dignity of man that he 'confesses that the sense of kinship with all creation, the realization that every living thing is a blood-relation, has been to him a source of intense joy.'

This leads him to find good and adumbrations of the end in the most primitive forms of religious expression. The African animist, with his belief in unseen spiritual powers, possesses the first essential element of a true faith, and is already on his way to a faith in One Supreme Good and Holy God; and the man who offered his beast in sacrifice was making a real sacrifice, and was a true forerunner of those who, with deeper appreciation of the spirituality of God, offered to Him the more acceptable sacrifice of the broken spirit and the contrite heart. To a generous outlook of this kind intolerance is alien: in whatever land the missionary may cast his lot, he finds that God has been there before him, preparing the way.

The discussion fittingly concludes with a chapter, which treats a familiar subject in a striking way, on The Lord's Prayer and Modern Thought. In commenting on the petition, 'Give us our bread for the coming day,' Dr. D'Arcy emphasizes what he boldly calls 'the Divine common sense of Jesus' in frankly recognizing that man must have the means of life before he can rise to other and higher things. This courageous recognition of indubitable fact is no less a feature of Dr. D'Arcy's long argument, and the greatest of all facts he finds in the saying, 'God is love.' Here, he says, 'we find the only clue to the final mystery of things.'

In the recent discussions of the Epistle to the Galatians the main points of difference have been concerning the geographical question of the district intended by 'Galatia,' the probable place and date at which the Epistle was written, and the relation of the facts mentioned by Paul to the narratives of the Book of Acts. There has been general agreement as to the nature of the Galatian movement which Paul is trying to check and the character of the opponents who have stirred his resentment.

The current view of the Galatian movement is far from being a recent view. It has been presented (with various differences in detail) by nearly all the books on the subject, and was substantially that of the ancient commentators—Chrysostom, Theodore of Mopsuestia, Jerome, Ambrosiaster. Something much like it seems to be stated in the neat second-century prologue to the Epistle commonly attributed to a Marcionite origin: 'Galatae sunt Graeci. Hi verbum veritatis primum ab apostolo acceperunt

sed post discessum ejus temptati sunt a falsis apostolis ut in legem et circumcisionem verterentur. Hos apostolus revocat ad fidem veritatis, scribens eis ab Epheso.'

The common assumption is a gratuitous one that the false teachers who 'bewitched' the Galatians were emissaries from the Judaizing party at Jerusalem, but the common assumption that the false teachers were Judaizers can hardly be regarded as gratuitous; indeed, it has remained practically unchallenged till within very recent years. It was challenged by Professor Wilhelm Lütgert, now of Berlin, in 1919, but in the disturbed period immediately following the war his views received little attention and seem generally to have escaped notice since that time. They have now been revived by Dr. James Hardy Ropes of Harvard.

Dr. Ropes is well known to students of the New Testament for his scholarly labours on the text of the Acts, which he edited in Jackson and Lake's 'The Beginnings of Christianity.' He appears to have been a pupil of Lütgert's, and the essay which he now publishes rests largely on the suggestions and instruction he has received from Lütgert, though the form of treatment is obviously Dr. Ropes' own. The essay is entitled *The Singular Problem of the Epistle to the Galatians*, and is issued as an extra number of the 'Harvard Theological Review' (Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Mass., U.S.A.).

The theory which an endeavour is here made to substantiate is that the most troublesome party in Galatia were not Judaizers at all. They were opposed to the Judaizers even more strongly than they were to the Apostle. They were 'pneumatici,' 'spiritual persons,' 'radicals,' 'perfectionists,' who, insisting upon the completely new status into which the gift of the Holy Spirit introduces believers, tended to cut off Christianity altogether from its roots in the Jewish religion, and to exempt themselves even from distinctions of right and wrong and from moral discipline. It would appear from recent studies of the Corinthian Epistles that they, and not the Judaizers, were Paul's most dangerous opponents in the Gentile world.

We cannot here analyse the able argument advanced by Dr. Ropes, working with Lütgert's original conception, in support of this theory, which greatly diminishes, as he claims, the chief difficulties of the Epistle. But it is a theory which can hardly fail to win the attention of the critics, sponsored as it is by two such recognized authorities in New Testament scholarship, and it provides, not improbably we think, a valuable clue to the interpretation of the situation in Galatia. It should be noted that it depends primarily upon the admission that the above-named type of opponents of Paul existed in the Gentile churches.

We should like, however, to show at least the bearing of the theory on the elucidation of the Epistle, granted that the 'radicals' were a party of opposition to Paul, and that they were active among the Galatians. The main positive teaching of the Epistle is that (1) faith in Christ is the only way of salvation, and a Gentile believer must not subject himself to the Jewish Law; (2) the believer in Christ, though a Gentile, is in full reality brought by faith into direct relation to Abraham and to the promises made to Abraham. But why should Paul elaborate, as he does, the second contention? It seems to be somewhat lacking in point if Paul is only meeting the arguments of Jewish Christians who are working on the minds of Gentile believers. It is not easy to see why these last should be particularly interested in their relationship to Abraham.

It is suggested that the second contention would have at least more point if Paul, besides sharply reproving the tendency to adopt Jewish rites, is regarded as repelling charges against himself on the part of the spiritually radical, the 'pneumatici,' who would have him sever the connexion of Christianity with Judaism altogether. This Paul would never do. And we may well imagine him explaining in defence of his essential faithfulness to the Jewish inheritance that Christians, even Gentile Christians, are 'sons of Abraham' through the freewoman, the Jews being 'sons of Abraham' merely through the bondwoman.

Dr. ROPES has tabulated some of the other difficulties under the current theory, and with a note of the chief of these we must conclude. (1) The supposed appeal of the Judaizers to the Jerusalem apostles is odd, since precisely the main contention of the Judaizers, that circumcision was necessary, was not shared by the Jerusalem apostles. (2) That he preaches circumcision is a singular ground for an attack on Paul by those who also preach it. (3) Extensive ethical instruction is introduced which, *if merely pastoral*, is hardly in place in this letter, and distinctly weakens Paul's main contention in behalf of freedom.

Our readers should consider whether the interpretation becomes easier on the alternative theory here suggested, that there was a sharp conflict in Galatia between two extreme parties, each of which exaggerated one side of Paul's teaching, and that the chief bitterness against Paul was on the part of some of those who insisted, as he declares that he too does, on the independence of the Christian faith from the Jewish Law and on the sufficiency of the Spirit.

Professor James Alex. ROBERTSON of the Church of Scotland College, Aberdeen, maintains in the midst of his academic labours and technical studies in theology, and despite them, that habit of attractive, popular utterance which helped in no small measure to give him distinction as a preacher. In his most recent work, *Who was Jesus of Nazareth?* (James Clarke; 5s. net), he has published eight lectures and papers gathered together from various directions. In the first of these, which gives the book its title, he inquires as to the meaning of Jesus for our human life. He concludes that Jesus' consciousness of standing in a unique relation to God and to men is an undeniable part of His mind, and absolutely demanded by His character. 'By His perfect response to the pressure and solicitation of the Spiritual World, that Spiritual World was finding, and even now finds, perfect access to the life of Humanity through Him.'

The second study is of Jesus as the 'Master Teacher.' His knowledge of the Old Testament and genius in selection are dwelt upon, then the lessons He taught and the method of His teaching. 'His one great principle as a Teacher—and it is the true ideal of all religious teaching—was just to let sanctified personality do its perfect work.' But His voice, His face, His mannerisms, His unobtrusiveness, His opportunism, His humour, were all part of His personality, and enter into our estimate of His teaching method.

'Surely there is humour in the idea of trying to fatten one's pig for market with a bucket of pearls; in the fantastic picture of a camel trying to shove itself through the eye of a needle; in the picture of a man complacently handing a stone to the child who had asked for bread; of the family sitting solemnly round an inverted tub from beneath which a feeble gleam or two of lamp-light is struggling; . . . of the Pharisee with a trumpeter heralding his progress down the street while he distributes his little doles, tremendously in love with himself; of another Pharisee straining out the daddy-long-legs from his wine, yet swallowing a camel, monstrous daddy-long-legs, hump, and pads, and sardonic smile as well.'

The third and fourth studies, 'The Tragic Schism: Can it be Healed?' are in the Atonement, and catch up the teaching both of Anselm and of McLeod Campbell. 'While Christ's Passion is the Holy God pronouncing judgment on, by bearing, sin, Christ's Passion is at the same time the sorrow of the sinner's confession, the perfect Amen . . . out of the heart of humanity to the reproach that speaks in God's injured Holy Love. Even so the hot tears of a mother over her wayward child, while they are a symbol of the cost she had to pay in the act of reconciliation, are a pathetic confession also . . . of *his* sin.'

In the fifth study it is claimed that the Christian

Church began its career in the 'Conversion of Peter.' It is well to be reminded of this in these days, in view of the claim so often made that it was Paul who actually founded the Christian Church. That bold resounding sentence to which Peter gave utterance on the Day of Pentecost—'Let all the house of Israel know assuredly, that God hath made that same Jesus, whom ye have crucified, both Lord and Christ'—is the veritable foundation-rock on which the Christian Church was built.

'The Mind of the Master on Immortality' is the next study. It is a study characteristic of the author, and perhaps we find him here at his best. He offers us a very suggestive exposition of the Synoptic passage in which Jesus apparently touches upon the religious argument for immortality ('I am the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob'), and adumbrates briefly, but also suggestively, his views on the moral conditions and implications of the fact of immortality.

The penultimate study is in the 'Authority of Scripture.' A rapid historical survey of this subject is followed by a constructive view of it, starting from the two principles, that the Word of God is not the letter of Scripture, but is contained in Scripture, and that the judge of what constitutes the Word of God in Scripture is, as the Reformers expressed it, 'the inner testimony of the Holy Spirit.' Here is how Dr. ROBERTSON expresses the dependence of the Christian revelation upon the revelation of God in the Israelitish and Jewish religion: 'Without the mountain-mass of Old Testament monotheism, could the stainless peak of New Testament revelation have risen up into the full blaze of God's sunlight?'

The concluding study of 'The Spirit of God, and the New Testament Experience,' was the inaugural lecture delivered by Dr. ROBERTSON on assuming the duties of his chair. Here he would recall us to the New Testament experience if we would revitalize our theology. For the New Testament experience was 'the most vitalising moment of history.' Upon it, as he has recaptured it for himself, he would base his confession of the Faith.

'I believe in God, through Jesus Christ, His only Son, our Lord. I give myself to God, who was in Christ reconciling the world to Himself. I share the assurance that the living Christ is present now and always in the fellowship of the faithful, labouring for the coming of His Kingdom among men. And, finally, I am persuaded that all the redeemed shall live for ever with Him and reign with Him in a perfected and unshakable Kingdom.'

◆

The Words from the Cross.

II. The Penitent Thief (Lk. xxiii. 39–43).

By PRINCIPAL W. M. MACGREGOR, D.D., GLASGOW.

THIS episode is not even hinted at by Mark, nor by Matthew, who, at this point, closely follows him; on the contrary, they bluntly record that both the brigands joined in the general reviling of Jesus. So it is not surprising that many serious students should treat it as not belonging to the earliest tradition; it is, says Montefiore, 'a special Lucan embroidery,' 'a dramatic incident which can lay no claim to be historical.' According to Holtzmann's view, the penitent thief is designed to represent the Gentile in his appeal and the welcome which Jesus is ready to give. The story is not history, it is argued: it is midrash or edifying teaching. But however plausibly such a view may be presented it must be pronounced hasty and precarious. Luke's account of the Passion is rich in independent material; his account of the night following the arrest in Gethsemane is far more vivid in its detail than Mark's, and he alone describes the appearance of Jesus before Herod, which closely joins on to other incidents in the common record. No doubt, as in his account of the Supper, he sometimes betrays the later influence of Paul, but this is not enough to warrant us in dismissing what is peculiar to him as unhistorical. He seems to have been in Paul's company during his detention at Cæsarea, and thus would have opportunity for meeting eye-witnesses of the Passion. It is possible, as J. H. Moulton insists, that Paul himself was one of these, and that the centurion in charge of the execution, who was so deeply moved at the end, was another; certainly the women who stood by were accessible with their recollections. Jerome hints at the danger of 'an interpretation flattering the ears of the public, but none the truer for that,' and in recent times we have had more than enough of a romantic and sentimental handling of the gospel records; yet the richness of Luke's separate sources of information forbids any dogmatic rejection of this narrative. In so early a document as the Gospel of Peter (which Dr. M. R. James dates before 150), we read that 'one of these malefactors reproached the executioners, saying, We have thus suffered for the evil we have done, but this Man who has become the Saviour of men, wherein has He injured you? And they were angry with him and commanded that his legs should not be broken that so he might die in torment.' The thieves appear with a wealth of legendary detail in the later Apocryphal writings; names are assigned to them, and of the penitent it is told that he was one of a party which captured Joseph and Mary and the Child on their way to Egypt, that at his urgent pleading they were released, and the Child foretold the destiny of His deliverer, and that thus on the Cross he could appeal to the Lord, and say—Remember me! But this is pure story-spinning, whereas the passage in the Gospel of Peter, in its form, stands out sufficiently clear from Luke's narrative to encourage the belief that in quarters which Mark had not explored there lingered the tradition of a dramatic confession from this dying robber of the character of his strangely matched Companion in death.

These men are called malefactors and robbers, but the words give little information as to their offence. Mark (15^7) refers to other rioters imprisoned with Barabbas, who, presumably, had been the leader in some rising (Mt 27^{16}), so it is natural to set these two in that connexion. They were not thieves so much as brigands, with at least some show of patriotism, whose immediate quarrel was with Rome. Such wild men, impatient of any government which has stood strictly for order, have seldom for long been unknown in the hills and hiding-places of Judæa; and if they had been able to read, the inscription above the head of Jesus might have moved them with peculiar exasperation. For this Man was there called—King of the Jews! that helpless, lacerated Figure! No wonder if at first they joined in the taunts of the crowd. They had struck at the authority of Rome, and were hanging now like trapped wolves, who had shown no pity and had asked for none. And death was at their throat.

The first queer sign of grace which Luke reports was the sudden exclamation of the one man to his fellow: 'Are you not afraid of God, now that we are up against it?' The mask of patriotism had fallen off, the lust of adventure and fight and the open air had died down, and nakedly he saw his life as it had been—pillage, murder, outrage in long succession; and it must all be answered for. Dr. Plummer pleads that 'there is no reason for supposing that the robber felt the need of obtaining forgiveness, since for the Jew death is an expiation for sin'; but perhaps this poor lad did not know much about theology, for certainly death was approaching as the King of Terrors. The Man whom they had derided, though He was in the same condemnation, had at least a better chance than they, for He had done nothing amiss; but they, with their black record, were drifting out to meet God. And he was afraid.

The larger part of most of the gospel stories is not told. In describing the call of Andrew and Peter, Mark says nothing of any previous acquaintance with Jesus, and yet there must have been such (*e.g.* Jn 1^{35-42}), or they would not so promptly have followed at His word. Luke tells of a notorious woman falling at Jesus' feet, but he tells nothing of the revolutionary experience which had brought her there. And in the same way he has nothing to report of the wandering rumours which had reached this lad's ears of the kindness and the power of Jesus; but the land was full of voices, and 'these things were not done in a corner.' He may actually have seen Jesus at work and heard Him speaking of the Kingdom He had come to establish and of His catholic call to enter it. If the tale is true (and there is no sufficient reason for doubting it), something of this kind there must have been; and so, with only a blind guess at what Jesus had to offer, he broke away from the invading terrors and, like a drowning man, he clutched at hope. Certainly Jesus did not look like winning through; yet He had spoken of His own triumph as certain and had fired the minds of many, so this lad was bold to cry: 'Lord, when thou comest to reign, remember me!' It may well be that doubts lurked in the background and that, in the recesses of his nature, it was rather '*if* thou comest' than 'when thou comest'; but he gave himself the benefit of the doubt, for he had a desperate 'will to believe.'

What could the Lord Jesus find to say to such a man in such a mood? Paul, as a preacher, had great faith in the worth of utter defeat as a preparation for welcoming Christ. No one, he felt, had ever tried harder than he to attain to the friendship of God by a process of doing everything that the Law required; with all his volcanic energy he had laboured in that direction, and he had failed so abjectly that he writes of 'what the Law could not do.' But he went about everywhere telling men how in the black night of his defeat, when he was left utterly without resource, Jesus came to him, and it seemed as if a new day had dawned. In another place (1 Co 1^{21}) he speaks of men's long-continued frustration in their intellectual seeking of God: 'with all its wisdom the world had not come to know God.' Patiently men had searched and striven—and they had failed. And that was the chance for the seeming 'foolishness of preaching.' Man's extremity is God's opportunity, we say, and this dying lad, dashed like a swimmer against a sheer cliff, with life shattered and all his plans and hopes defeated, caught at Christ.

His prayer, in the form of it, was vague enough: 'when thou comest to reign—in some perhaps remote to-morrow—do not forget me!' But the answer comes definite and spacious: '*uberior est gratia quam petitio*,' says Ambrose, grace is wealthier than any petition, for God is able to do exceeding abundantly above what we ask or think; yet even in the vague petition I think there was a notable flash of insight into the inner disposition of Jesus. When the prophet depicts the day when Christ comes to reign (Rev 6^{16}) he describes men as then calling on mountains and rocks to fall and hide them from His face; in such a day of sheer dread and cataclysm is it likely that He will have an eye for the broken earthenware, the waste and rubbish of the world? But this man somehow guessed more worthily at the heart of Jesus. At the outset of the ministry, Jesus had declared it as His business to preach good news to poor people, to proclaim sight to the blind, and release to captives and the crushed; He compared Himself to a shepherd not content if even one of those entrusted to him is lost, but seeking until he finds the one. Such was His way throughout these crowded years, and when He comes to reign will He be different? A Hebrew poet (Ps $72^{12.14}$), singing of the King who will some day appear, asserts as His peculiarity that 'He will deliver the needy when they cry . . . and precious will their blood be in his sight'; and this dying brigand, in like fashion, appealed not to the power so much as to the pitifulness of the Lord Jesus, who took note of every obscure and despicable thing.

When we consider the actual reply of Jesus we find ourselves embarrassed by the tendency of scholars to give a certain dogmatic and almost geographical fixity to words which were consoling and heartening because they were imaginative. This wild, terror-hunted creature had no concern with doctrinal distinctions, about which he knew nothing. But 'with Me'—that meant something real; and 'to-day'—that had comfort in it; and 'in Paradise'—in God's garden, in which He walks and from which Adam was banished, that was good to hear. But such imaginative and emotional understandings, though they might suit a dying man, are far too simple for the technical theologian, so he strikes in with his distracting and really irrelevant questions—What and where is Paradise? how promptly is it attained? and so on. Is it the Heaven of consummation, where men at length shall see God face to face? or is it the happy side of the underworld—the ***refrigerium*** or resting-place, as some of the Fathers called it, where the souls of good men abide in peace until the day of resurrection? Irenæus reports the opinion that Paradise is a kind of secondary heaven, and that whilst those who have borne fruit a hundredfold pass to the highest, those who have borne but sixty attain only to Paradise. Did Paul in 2 Co $12^{2.4}$ mean his readers to understand that 'the third heaven' (v.^{2}) and 'Paradise' (v.^{4}) are the same? or that, passing beyond the third heaven, he was caught up into Paradise (as a higher level) and heard unutterable things? And so it goes—a whirl of fantastic and inconsistent and unprofitable speculation. In the New Testament the word is sparingly used—only three times; and as in two of these passages (2 Co 12^{4}, Rev 2^{7}) it plainly means the Heaven of God, it is natural to give it the same meaning here. But then it is objected by the precise that Jesus did not pass to that high Heaven until after the Ascension: He went and preached to the disobedient spirits in prison, says

Peter, and His dwelling for a time must have been with the disembodied who await the Resurrection and the fulness of their glory. Thus the mind is invaded by entangling questions of the topography of the unseen world, as if it were a wide region with frontiers and barricades, within which each soul according to its deserts is confined. Jesus, it is argued, could not have meant that the dying man would that day be with Him in the Heaven of God, because He Himself would not yet be there and the thief would not be ready. Accordingly, on the one side, the Arabic Gospel of the Infancy represents Jesus as saying that the thief would go *before* Him into Paradise—a doubtful comfort to a man who, in every fibre of his being, knew his unfitness to enter there unless Jesus took him. And on the other side, Dr. Zahn, with equal excess of prose, alters the punctuation, and makes Jesus say: 'To-day I tell you, that you shall be with me (sometime) in Paradise.' That kills the promise, for it would drive the poor wretch back into the vagueness of a remote 'some day.' Throughout His ministry Jesus made much of the floodtides of emotion in those He met. Men came to Him protesting their desire to follow Him, only there was this or that to be attended to first: 'I must go home to my father till he dies, and then I will come,' said one, and got the answer, 'Come now, or you will never come!' For the tide runs back, and there will be no depth of water to carry you over the bar. The outburst of the sinful woman at His feet might easily have been suspected as hysterical, but Jesus took her at the flood and steered her out on to the wide ocean of God's peace. To displace the word 'to-day,' as Zahn does, in the interest of a theory about the life in the unseen, is to misunderstand Christ's way with human souls and to rob His promise to this desperate believer of its noble aptness and its power.

These discussions and distinctions had a certain interest for old-fashioned scholastic theologians, and in altered forms they appeal to many of the moderns. John Weiss suggests that the originator of this story could not have had clearly in his mind the narrative of the Resurrection and Ascension, as it implies that for a time Christ was not in Paradise. Such argumentation seems to me to suffer from a twofold irrelevance: it is irrelevant to any worthy conception of Christ and God, and it is supremely irrelevant to the human situation exhibited in the story. Are we really to suppose that because He was preaching to the spirits in prison, Christ could not be in the very presence of the King? The universe in which He lives is not broken up by frontier walls, so that when He is here He must necessarily be absent from other regions. 'It is not by journeying that one comes to God,' says Augustine, 'it is by loving,' and these prosaic topographical distinctions are merely obscuring. Still more glaring is the irrelevance to the human situation described. Here is a desperate creature who has never had a life in thought, on whom anything evasive or subtle must be thrown away, and to him Jesus is bound to speak in the language he can apprehend. Wellhausen does justice to the plainness of the promise, but hesitates about extending it from this one individual to any of our race: others may have longer roads to travel, but for this man the way home must be straight. I doubt if even this distinction is required, for the promise is—'Thou shalt be *with me*.' '*Ubi Christus*,' says Ambrose, '*ibi vita, ibi regnum*'—where Christ is there is life, and there is the Kingdom. 'The kingdom cometh not with outward show,' said Jesus (Lk 17[21. 22]), 'and men shall not say, Lo, here it is! or Lo, there! for the kingdom of God is in your midst'; and He said again to all who follow Him—Where I am, there shall also My servant be.

Old-fashioned evangelical preachers were fond of the saying: 'One dying thief was saved that no man should despair, but only one that no man should presume.' And at this we may leave the matter.

Natural Law and Miracles.

By the Reverend J. H. Morrison, M.A., Bucksburn, Aberdeen.

The controversy about miracles and natural law is, in its acute form, of modern origin. Men in former times were untroubled by it. To them the world was a place of mystery whose wonders were unexplored. There was, therefore, ample room for the unprecedented, and when it occurred it might excite wonder but not incredulity. It was readily accepted as part of the mystery of things. There were practically no limits to belief.

Modern science, however, has bred a very different mentality. Science may be represented as a determined effort to clear up the mystery of things, an effort which, superficially at least, has been attended with marvellous success. Masses of superstition have been cleared away, and light has been let into many dark places. Things have been arranged in order and classified, laws have been discovered regulating the sequence of events, and, above all, there has grown up in men's minds an irresistible conviction of the entire orderliness of Nature. This great movement was doubtless accompanied with a certain pride of achievement which led to grave error. A strong tendency arose to deny reality to anything that could not be classified and brought under law. Miracles became an especial rock of offence. They were out of order and must be relegated to the lower limbo where ancient superstitions impotently gnash their teeth. Spinoza opened the modern attack on miracles as violations of the order of Nature, and Matthew Arnold exemplified the amazing cocksureness of nineteenth-century science in his fatuous remark, 'Miracles do not happen.'

This formidable assault has been met in two different ways, which may be expressed as defiance and surrender. Some religious people, of whom the Fundamentalists may be taken as typical, simply defy science and ignore its findings. Relying on religious conviction, they refuse to believe that God can be hampered in His working, and the more incomprehensible a miracle is the more they glory in it as manifestly Divine. Science must not be suffered with profane feet to tread on holy ground. Other religious people, of whom we may take the Modernist as typical, have made a more or less abject surrender to science, and in deference to its demands have given up their belief in miracles, or at least physical miracles. Now, like blinded captives grinding in the mills of the Philistines, they labour to show that everything of spiritual value is conserved, that the Christian faith suffers no loss when relieved of this incubus.

Neither of these positions can be regarded as satisfactory or as holding out any promise of settled peace between science and religion. On the one hand to defy science is not only hopeless but irreligious. For all truth is of God and must be welcomed from whatever quarter, even though it may seem to contradict some cherished belief. On the other hand it may be taken for certain that religion will never consent to cringe to science and speak only what science permits. 'Men of science tell us' is but a pitiful substitute for 'Thus saith the Lord.' It has been significantly pointed out that Modernism, which yesterday rejected the healing miracles of Jesus at the bidding of science, to-day accepts them because science now concedes the possibility of psycho-therapy.[1] The Christian faith, unless doomed to perish, must sooner or later burst this servile bond.

Surely some middle path of reconciliation can be found. The question naturally suggests itself, 'Why should there be any conflict between science and religion?' To the religious mind at least it must be axiomatic that whatever is true in science or religion must be one harmonious whole, and that nothing that is not true can be vital to either. To this the scientist also would cordially assent. Must it not appear, then, that some element of misunderstanding has crept in, which, as so often happens, leads the one side to deny what the other side never meant to affirm? In such cases a patient and sympathetic study of what is really believed and affirmed on both sides usually helps to clear the air of misunderstandings and point the way of reconciliation.

Professor Whitehead [2] has taught us impressively the need for closely questioning the presuppositions of an argument. What everybody takes for granted becomes the lurking-place of error. It is by such questioning of presuppositions that the revolution of the new physics has been brought about. Now in the case before us the thing which is taken for granted on both sides is a certain conception of natural law. The matter in dispute is whether or not miracles can be reconciled with natural law, and the question is rarely asked, 'What exactly is meant by natural law?' But that is a question which needs very urgently to be asked. For, obviously, until we have precisely defined what we mean by natural law, we are not in a position to say what would constitute a violation of it, or whether it could in any case be violated.

I. NATURAL LAW

It will be found that a deep confusion of thought has arisen in many minds with regard to natural law and the uniformity of Nature, so that an important distinction is lost sight of, and two things, in themselves very different, are not clearly discriminated in our thinking. The distinction referred to is the distinction between *reality* and *perceived reality*, between Nature in itself and Nature as known to us.

(1) The phrase 'the uniformity of Nature'

---

[1] D. S. Cairns, *The Faith that Rebels*, 39.

[2] *Science and the Modern World*, 36.

expresses the idea that the universe is an orderly whole, a cosmos, a rational system with nothing freakish or chaotic about it. In accordance with this we must conceive that there are laws of Nature, whether known or unknown to us, which are the necessary embodiment and expression of this essential rationality of the universe. This, be it observed, is a matter of faith. Science has not yet proved that the world is an orderly whole. There might be a realm of chaos beyond our ken. Not till we had searched to the outmost bounds and to the inmost depths could we have proof that Nature is uniform. Nevertheless faith in the uniformity of Nature completely possesses every scientific mind. It is the first article of the scientific creed. To ask the man of science to renounce it is to ask him to abjure his religion. He will reply with utter and passionate conviction that it is unthinkable.

With this faith in the uniformity of Nature Christianity can have no quarrel, for, rightly understood, it is an essential element in the Christian faith. Whitehead has pointed out[1] that 'the inexpugnable belief' in the rationality of Nature which inspires modern science is derived 'from the medieval insistence on the rationality of God.' St. Paul gives expression to the magnificent faith that the universe is a realm of love. 'Neither death, nor life, nor things present, nor things to come, shall be able to separate us from the love of God.' This assertion goes far beyond experience, yet it must of necessity be held, unless all the Apostle's knowledge of the love of God in Christ was to be thrown into utter confusion. With equal conviction he would have held that the universe is a realm of reason, for faith in the uniformity of Nature ultimately rests on this, that there is one God and Nature is His handiwork.

(2) But now we fall into a disastrous error if we go on to assume, as is commonly done, that reality *as perceived by us* is equal to reality in itself, or, in other words, that the laws of Nature as formulated by science express the full and final truth. Professor J. S. Haldane[2] points out that 'for Newton physical reality, as he conceived it, was in actual fact reality.' And he adds, 'most of the modern civilized world has agreed with him in this conclusion, which has thus become to such an extent part of the generally accepted intellectual outfit of modern times that it is only by great effort, and at the risk of being regarded as mere cranks, that we can bring ourselves to question it.' Undoubtedly the idea is widespread that in the realm of science nothing is dealt with but incontrovertible facts, and that when science formulates a law of Nature that law has universal validity and Divine authority, so that to alter it is impossible and to question it is impious. It might seem too brusque were we to say with Professor Whitehead that 'this position on the part of scientists was pure bluff,'[3] but certainly it is a position which requires to be closely scrutinized and not taken for granted.

The so-called 'laws of Nature,' as formulated by science, are simply generalizations of human experience. Now our experience of the physical world comes through the senses, and it should never be forgotten how extremely limited in their range our senses are. They are far from being able to apprehend all that is there in the physical world to be apprehended. We spell out a few vibrations as meaning to us Sound, a few others as Heat, a few more as Light, but beyond these there are countless vibrations passing round us and through us without leaving any impression of which we are conscious. The range of the senses has been immensely increased by the aid of scientific instruments of precision, yet even with such aids an incalculable amount of Nature escapes our observation. Take the case of isotopes. There is a substance which we call lead. It is not a compound, but one of the elements. It cannot be analysed, it answers to every chemical test as lead. Yet all lead is not the same lead. There are certain intra-atomic differences which, if we could only grasp them, would doubtless cause us to revise our definition of lead. Such things suggest the existence of a whole world of sub-atomic activity which goes clean beyond our ken. There is considerable ground for thinking that the nucleus of an atom may be as complex and as thickly populated as the city of London. The wonders of wireless have in recent years helped to bring home to the popular mind the fact that the surrounding ether is no dead vacuum, but is all alive with electrical activity, however little we may perceive it. The world, then, would appear to be a far fuller place than we ordinarily take it to be. There is a subtlety of connexion between things far more intricate and refined than we can discern. Hence, when we venture to make any general statement about the forces and potencies of Nature, however scientific it may seem to us and however useful practically, we must bear in mind that it is based upon a very rough and imperfect knowledge of Nature and is by no means an adequate expression of the complexity of the facts.

---

[1] *Science and the Modern World*, 18.

[2] *The Sciences and Philosophy*, 5.

[3] *Science and the Modern World*, 277–278.

But this does not complete the story of our limitations. We suffer from a disability even more profound, in respect of the fact that we ourselves are part of Nature and can only view things from our own angle. We are as little able to see the many-sided truth in its fullness as a man looking out at the window is able to see all round the house. It is this necessary limitation of outlook which gives rise to those antinomies which have given so much trouble in the realms of theology and philosophy. In the famous Free Church case Lord Haldane argued with great force and learning that the Westminster Confession taught both Predestination and Free Will, and that both these doctrines were held by the Church, though to our view contradictory. His argument met with but scant success among the law lords, for the legal mind naturally abhors a break in the chain of reasoning. But the fact remains that not in theology alone, but if you take science, if you take the nature of time and space, if you take things of everyday experience, and try to track them out to their ultimate meaning, you find, at every turn, contradiction. As Lord Balfour pointed out in his *Foundations of Belief*, 'the contradictions in theology are not more striking than the contradictions of science.'

This aspect of things has been anew impressed upon us with great force by the recent advances in Physics. It might be said that the most remarkable result of the New Physics has been to unearth a mass of antinomies which science can as yet see no possible means of reconciling. Take the case of light. Two theories have at different times held the field—Newton's theory that light consists in the emission of particles, Huyghens' theory that light consists of ether waves. What is the position to-day? In Whitehead's words it is this: 'The two theories are contradictory. In the eighteenth century Newton's theory was believed, in the nineteenth century Huyghens' theory was believed. To-day there is one large group of phenomena which can be explained only on the wave theory, and another large group which can be explained only on the corpuscular theory. Scientists have to leave it at that, and wait for the future, in the hope of attaining some wider vision which reconciles both.'[1] A strikingly Christian attitude, one may remark in passing! The case is similar with regard to the constitution of the atom where theories are held which, though in themselves contradictory, are found to be necessary to cover the variety of the phenomena. The difficulty is such that scientists are driven, as Bertrand Russell whimsically says, to use one theory on Monday, Wednesday, and Friday, and the contradictory theory on Tuesday, Thursday, and Saturday.

What does all this mean but just that our apprehension of reality is very meagre and partial? Light is neither waves nor corpuscles, but some mysterious entity far transcending both, though in some of its manifestations it may resemble now one, now the other. The atom is something which at one moment appears physical, at another spiritual; which confounds the laws of motion by being able to be in two places at the same time; which seems now to exist and again to be only a possibility of existence; in short, something which completely eludes description and baffles imagination. The meagreness of our apprehension of reality may, perhaps, be illustrated in this way. A good deal is written in these days about the fourth dimension, and we are being taught that though we are conscious only of a world of three dimensions, in reality the world is of four, and most probably of N, dimensions. What idea could a two-dimensional being form of our three-dimensional world? Suppose there were beings whose whole world was the floor of this room. They would observe certain regular markings which we know as the feet of chairs and tables; they would see footprints appearing and disappearing mysteriously; they could trace the outline of the cat sleeping on the rug, and a few other things. But if, on the basis of these, they proceeded to philosophize about the whole contents and ongoings of the room, how utterly beyond their powers the task would be, and how childish doubtless to our minds their most profound conclusions would appear. Is our philosophy any more adequate, for it may be said that we, too, are but philosophers of the floor, dimly scanning 'the footprints of the Creator.' All that we see and know is, as Job said, 'the mere fringe of his force, the faintest whisper we can hear of him. Who knows the full thunder of his power?'

All this may warn us to take a very modest view of those formulations which we have made and which we have dignified with the title of Laws of Nature. They are all imperfect and subject to emendation. If a new fact emerges, room must be found for it. If our theory cannot find room for it, our theory stands condemned. It must be enlarged to accommodate the fact, and if need be, scrapped. There is nothing sacrosanct about these Laws. They have no authority over facts, except such artificial and mock authority as we by our definition have conferred upon them. If we define a yard as three feet, then, of course, there will always and inevitably be three feet to the yard, for the simple reason that if there were not it would not be a yard according to our definition. So, if science defines an oak tree as being marked by certain characteristics, then of course all oak trees will manifest these characteristics, because if they did not they would not be oak trees. Having in this solemn and portentous way formulated a so-called Law, we bow in reverence before the idol we have set up. All the generalizations which we call Laws of Nature are really of this sort. Being unable to cope with the complexity of phenomena and the infinite variety and individuality of things, we throw them into groups which we label, and then we proceed to make general remarks about the group. These groupings and these generalizations are for practical purposes most necessary and of inestimable value, but we err if we forget that each individual is infinitely more than a mere member of our group, that it has other qualities, connexions, and potencies which we for the moment are ignoring or which we are totally ignorant of.

---

[1] *Science and the Modern World*, 264.

It cannot be too clearly understood that twentieth-century science has completely robbed natural law of the illegitimate authority conferred upon it by the science of the nineteenth century. This is principally the work of those philosophic physicists who have done so much to clear the thought of our time. They have brought fully into view the immense difference between Nature in the fullness of its reality and Nature as perceived by us. While still believing in the essential rationality of the universe, they have shown that our formulations come far short of expressing that rationality. Eddington has even suggested that an insurmountably irrational element may remain with us to the end. 'It is one thing for the human mind to extract from the phenomena of Nature the laws which it has itself put into them; it may be a far harder thing to extract laws over which it has had no control. It is even possible that laws which have not their origin in the mind may be irrational, and we can never succeed in formulating them.'[1]

II. Miracles.

How, then, does the case for miracles stand in the light of this discussion? It would be greatly helpful if those who attack and those who defend miracles would come to some agreement as to what they mean by a miracle. No definition is, of course, to be found in Scripture. Miracles are simply spoken of by such indefinite terms as 'wonderful works,' or 'signs and wonders,' while often the story is told without comment of any kind. The miracles of Jesus are often referred to as His 'works.' No doubt these 'works' were regarded as striking evidence of the presence and direct action of God, but it should be remembered that in that age the hand of God was seen in everything that happened, and the idea that Laws of Nature could operate as it were automatically and without the direct will of the Creator was not present in any mind. When, therefore, we speak of miracles as violations of the Laws of Nature, or when we make a distinction between the natural and the supernatural, we are introducing categories of our own, which it behoves us carefully to define. We must also be on our guard lest by our definitions we take up indefensible positions and bring upon ourselves difficulties of our own making. Suppose we should agree to take the word 'miracle' in its original meaning as simply 'a wonderful event,' would any scientist deny that in that sense miracles have happened and may happen? The whole story of evolution is a record of the successive emergences of the unprecedented, and it is generally believed that the process is still going on. So that there could not be, in the name of reason, any *a priori* ruling out of the miraculous.

It might have been well if the word 'miracle' had retained its original simple meaning, so that we should have been left free to examine with unbiassed minds the record of any wonderful event. The term, however, has become inextricably involved in our time with questions of natural law, and its significance in that connexion requires to be made clear. Two positions may be maintained, both of which would seem to be unobjectionable from the point of view of science.

(*a*) *Miracles are not contrary to Nature.* When we affirm a miracle we do not mean to deny the rationality of the universe. We do not mean to assert that something has happened which is lawless, or chaotic, or in any way violates the Divine order of the cosmos. On the contrary, we most strongly affirm that a miracle is in perfect harmony with all the other works of God. This is no new idea, no concession to modern criticism. It is emphasized by Augustine, who may be said to have given the first philosophy of the miraculous. His argument is that as God's will is the ultimate source of all things, nothing can be *contra naturam* which happens by God's will. Everything is natural, not to us but to God. Miracles are part of an established order. They are not *contra naturam*, but may be contrary to what is known to us of Nature.

---

[1] *Space, Time, and Gravitation*, 200.

In view of this, it is perhaps unfortunate that the term 'supernatural' is so commonly associated with miracles. Here we have introduced a category which is not scriptural. By our contrast of natural and supernatural we have fostered the idea that there is a lower world which runs by its own mechanical laws and from which the direct action of God is excluded, and over against that a higher world where God dwells and out of which He makes occasional excursions into the lower world. Religiously this doctrine is disastrous, and few things are more necessary in our time than a strong reaffirmation of the truth that God is everywhere on the spot, and that no laws intervene between Him and His creatures to hamper His working. But not only is this doctrine disastrous to religion, it is in the highest degree offensive to science, indeed to any rational mind. The universe must be one coherent whole, a single orderly system, else human reason itself is confounded. Thus we find Professor J. S. Haldane in his *Gifford Lectures* protesting at once in the name of science and of religion against the idea of the supernatural. 'It is only a narrow view of what is "natural" that prevents our recognizing the presence of God everywhere within and around us.' 'With those who imagine that science can or will present anything but the firmest opposition to beliefs in supernatural events I cannot for a moment agree. To ask science to desist from this opposition would be equivalent to asking her to abjure her religion.' And again, 'Nature is nothing but a manifestation of God, so that the very idea of anything supernatural is contrary to religion.'[1]

It is evident that Augustine and Professor Haldane are in substantial agreement. If by 'Nature' you mean this whole orderly system as the handiwork of God, then obviously miracles are part of that system, and it is difficult to imagine any religious man believing or asserting anything else. But Professor Haldane should, in fairness, remember that the term 'Nature' has a variety of more limited meanings. It is sometimes contrasted with 'history,' though history is part of Nature in the widest sense. It is also sometimes contrasted with 'grace.' So then, it is hardly legitimate to assume, as Professor Haldane does, that whenever the supernatural is spoken of, it is to be taken as a denial of 'Nature' in the widest sense, a violation of the Divine order of the universe, the introduction of an intolerable element of irrationality. On the other hand, seeing that this misunderstanding has arisen, and scientific minds are alienated by it, every effort should be made to remove it. Some religious writers have endeavoured to do this by using, instead of 'supernatural,' such terms as 'præternatural' or 'supernormal.' Whatever may be thought of these terms, Augustine's principle, that miracles are not *contra naturam*, should be continually reasserted and held in view.

(*b*) While miracles are not to be understood as contrary to Nature, they may *transcend our knowledge of Nature*, so as to be quite inexplicable by any known laws. When we remember how limited our knowledge of Nature is, it seems easy to concede this as a possibility. Only in times when science has forgotten her limitations has she presumed to say what was possible and what impossible. The science of to-day is in a wiser and more chastened mood. Physicists are literally snowed under at the moment with the unprecedented and the inexplicable. 'Heaven knows,' exclaims Whitehead, 'what seeming nonsense may not to-morrow be demonstrated truth.'[2] In these circumstances we dare not close our minds to the possibility that some occurrences, though totally inexplicable to us, may yet be essential elements of reality. The spirit of science itself demands this attitude, for, as has already been remarked, all along the line of evolution there have been points at which the unprecedented and the inexplicable have appeared.

In saying that miracles transcend our knowledge of Nature we do not, and we need not, affirm that they must for ever remain inexplicable. Our knowledge of Nature grows, and what would have seemed miraculous to one age may be commonplace to the next. Had it been recorded in the Gospels that the Sermon on the Mount was distinctly audible in Jerusalem, the scientist of yesterday would have said, 'Impossible,' the schoolboy of to-day would say, 'H'm! Wireless.' With our advancing knowledge of the power of mind over body there has been an increasing tendency to accept Christ's miracles of healing as historical, while rejecting the so-called Nature miracles. It may be that a future generation, having gained a deeper knowledge of the intimate connexion between spirit and matter, will find it just as easy to accept the Nature miracles. The question has been mooted whether with the advance of science the world may not hope to see the miracles of the gospel repeated and surpassed. This possibility also need not be foreclosed, only it should be observed that the Gospels represent the power by which the miracles were wrought as being not simply intellectual but principally moral and spiritual through faith in God. So far is Christ from speaking of His miracles as utterly beyond man's power that, on the contrary, He explicitly declares that, where His spirit is, the like, and even 'greater works,' may be wrought.

---

[1] *The Sciences and Philosophy*, 310, 322, 336.

[2] *Science and the Modern World*, 166.

It is not within the scope of this article to deal with the historical evidence for miracles or with their religious value. The aim has simply been to remove certain objections to the possibility of miracles which have been urged in the name of science, and to clear the way for an unbiassed approach to the records. Once it is conceded that unprecedented and inexplicable events have occurred and may occur, then the credibility of any miracle becomes a question of historical evidence. Each case falls to be examined on its own merits. Many doubtless, after examination, we shall be disposed to reject; regarding others we may be disposed to suspend our judgment. The gospel miracles will be felt by every unbiassed mind to stand in a class by themselves, because of their connexion with a personality confessedly unique.

Into this great subject it is impossible here to enter. Suffice it to suggest that the whole record of evolution is the record of a progressive mastery of spirit over matter; that in human history man's power to achieve has been in proportion to the supremacy within him of spiritual elements such as intelligence and will; and that there are other spiritual elements, particularly goodness and faith in God, by which men have been lifted above themselves and enabled, as by the inspiration of the Almighty, to do what otherwise would have been impossible. Not unnaturally, therefore, the hope arose and was cherished that in the fullness of time there would come an Ideal Man in whom spiritual forces would have complete sway, a very Hero of faith, an Incarnation of God, fully commissioned and empowered to redeem the world. The Christian faith is that in the man Christ Jesus this hope has been fulfilled, and that His mastery over Nature is completely congruous with His personality and mission. In which case it is futile criticism to examine His miracles one by one as isolated events. The whole situation must be faced; the whole record of the life and ministry is of a piece, and manifestly bears the stamp of uniqueness. If the record be studied in that way it will appear that the miracles are the natural and inevitable 'works' of Jesus, that is to say, as naturally the outcome of His spiritual power as the works of Shakespeare were the outcome of the genius of the poet. In that case the miracles of Jesus are not to be apologized for, or timidly defended, still less are they to be explained away. They are to be gloried in, as the apostolic Church gloried in them, because they are at once a revelation of God's almighty power to save, and a pledge of what man may be and do when restored to spiritual fellowship with God.

◆

Literature.

MR. MIDDLETON MURRY'S RETROGRESSION.

THOSE who read Mr. Murry's 'Life of Jesus' with sympathy and appreciation, despite his obvious lack of equipment in certain directions, must have hoped that the book marked a stage in a religious progress towards a fuller Christian faith. This hope is rudely shattered by the new volume which Mr. Murry has just published under the title *God: Being an Introduction to the Science of Metabiology*, by Mr. John Middleton Murry (Cape; 10s. 6d. net). Mr. Murry lands finally (if it be finally) in a complete and self-contained naturalism. He has gone 'beyond God.' He is not an agnostic; he is an atheist. He is not uncertain about God, he denies Him altogether: 'We deny God, and we will to deny Him utterly.' The writer's course is summed up by himself in three phrases: 'I have been, by this compulsion, a God-seeker, and a God-finder, and a God-denier. I deny him more gladly than I found him, though the finding was glad enough.' How really he disbelieves in God is made clear in a passage which is happily the only piece of 'smart' writing in the book: '"God" and I, one might almost say, are a little tired of each other. It is time for us to part. This book is the story of the parting. It seems to me that we part on good terms, better, far better, than I should have ever imagined possible.'

But Mr. Murry still entertains a radiant admiration for Jesus, for the beauty of His life and the fidelity of His obedience to duty. And he understands Jesus. It would not perhaps be too much to say that he alone understands Jesus. For he has had the same experience as Jesus had. A large part of the book is occupied with a touching and poignant record of Mr. Murry's spiritual history. It was a courageous thing on his part to expose to the world the details of his life that brought about a crisis out of which peace and illumination came. It was a case of divided personality, a terrible conflict between heart and mind. And the final solution came as a vision of perfect unity, first unity within himself, and then the certainty of the universe as a unity outside himself. Jesus at His baptism had the same experience. It is true He called it God and knew Himself as at one with God. So did Mr. Murry at first. But he saw afterwards that this was a mistake. Jesus stated His experience in the language of the time. But there is no need of God at all. The unity is there. 'The mist of God disperses to reveal the wonder of the things that simply are.'

It is hardly necessary to point out that there is not a shadow of evidence that Jesus ever had anything like the torturing experience of disunity described in this book. But evidence is a thing Mr. Murry can do without. Twice over he asserts that Jesus Himself denied that He worked miracles, and the sole support of this assertion is the saying, 'an evil and adulterous generation seeketh after a sign, and no sign shall be given it.' The idea of miracles fills Mr. Murry with 'a loathing that is almost nausea. If I could really *believe*, that once, veritably, Jesus rose in the body, I should go mad.' The supernatural in the life of Jesus is thus cleared off the board with a sweep of the hand, and we can work out the problem presented by mystical experiences within the borders of 'the things that simply are.'

It is really difficult to assess the value of a book like this. As a record of moral and spiritual autobiography it is impressive and engrossing. As a new metaphysic, a new psychology, and a religion without God it is perplexing and unconvincing. There are few persons who have had, or are likely to have, his 'mystical' experience. There are still fewer who will be able to find within a pure naturalism the motive for lofty ideals. One can only hope that this able and earnest seeker will yet find his way to something better and more inspiring than the conclusion he reaches in this curious essay.

AUTHORITY IN RELIGION.

The substance of the Rev. Dr. R. H. Strachan's new book, *The Authority of Christian Experience* (S.C.M.; 7s. 6d. net), consists of the lectures delivered by the author on the Alexander Robertson Trust at the University of Glasgow in 1929. The subject dealt with is of supreme interest and importance, and the writer gives evidence of wide scholarship, earnest thinking, and literary skill in every chapter. His main contention is that the seat of authority in religion is the individual Christian conscience, but he safeguards this central position from subjectivism and caprice by acknowledging the value of the religious community and of historical revelation. The reader will find searching criticisms on mere external authority in Bible or Church a very helpful refutation of some psychologists' view that religion is an illusion and, in what in our view are the best chapters in the book, a consideration of the relation between science and religion. In Part IV. he deals with the Authority of Jesus, but in our opinion this section suffers from the attempt to crush too much matter into too small a space. The real crux of the problem of authority and experience is to combine into one theory the two factors which the Reformers called the Word of God and the ***testimonium Spiritus Sancti internum***, and we are of the opinion that the emphasis must be put on the former, both as the originator of experience and as its corrective. It is very difficult as one feels in reading this excellent volume to get out of subjectivism if one stresses 'experience' even to the extent this writer does. The historical side of Christianity is a datum preceding individual experience, and experience does not create data—but has to accept and interpret them. The writer admits all this on one page and seems to contradict it on the next, which shows how difficult it is to do justice to this vexed question. We would not say this were we not aware that in this book we have a notable and worthy contribution toward the understanding of a great problem.

THE PRISON EPISTLES.

A new study of first-rate importance dealing with the Pauline Epistles has appeared from the pen of Professor G. S. Duncan, entitled *St. Paul's Ephesian Ministry* (Hodder & Stoughton; 8s. 6d. net). The tradition which assigns the Prison Epistles to Rome has in recent years been questioned by various critics. Deissmann in particular has given the weight of his name in support of the theory that Ephesus was the place of their origin. It was at his suggestion that Professor Duncan undertook a thorough study of the whole question. The result is the present volume, which is the most complete monograph on the subject that has yet appeared. The direct evidence in support of the theory is of course very slight. The Acts gives no hint of any imprisonment in Ephesus. This silence, however, is not conclusive, for 'how little there is in Acts corresponding to the sufferings enumerated in 2 Co $11^{23\text{ff.}}$. "Five times received I from the Jews the thirty-nine stripes"—Acts gives us no instance of this; "thrice was I beaten (by the Romans) with rods"—Acts relates only one such beating, at Philippi; "in prisons more abundantly"—up to this period Acts tells of only one imprisonment, that at Philippi; "three times was I shipwrecked, a day and a night I was adrift at sea"—of these experiences there is not a hint in Acts.' One of the most interesting parts of Professor Duncan's argument is that in which he offers reasons drawn from the political situation which would make it inadvisable for Luke to make any reference to Silanus the pro-consul of Asia. The main support of the theory, however, is drawn from a study of the Prison Epistles. '*The* great argument for an Ephesian imprisonment is that it provides by far the most intelligible setting for some (the present writer would prefer to say, for all) of these Epistles.' To mention but one point, 'According to the traditional view, Aristarchus, Epaphras, Onesimus, Timothy, Mark, Tychicus, Jesus, Justus, Luke, Demas, Epaphroditus are all in Rome.' Yet most, if not all, are Asiatics who with one or two possible exceptions have no connexion with Rome. It may be felt that Professor Duncan elaborates his theory to excess when he argues for three separate outbreaks of hostility in Ephesus, accompanied by one or more imprisonments. His book, however, is one which deserves and will doubtless receive the careful attention of New Testament scholars, for obviously its thesis, if accepted, would have far-reaching effects on Pauline chronology and New Testament study generally.

DR. DEISSMANN ON THE NEW TESTAMENT.

The Haskell Lectures for 1929 were delivered at Oberlin, Ohio, and are now published under the title *The New Testament in the Light of Modern Research*, by Adolf Deissmann, D.Theol., D.D., Litt.D., Professor of Theology in the University of Berlin (Hodder & Stoughton; 6s. net). These lectures remind us now of 'Light from the Ancient East,' and again of 'The Religion of Jesus and the Faith of Paul,' and the message of each of these former books is repeated here. For one thing the Christian religion arose among the working classes. It was simple, and spoke a simple language, not the Attic Greek, but the 'common' Greek of the fireside. And it remained, during nearly all the New Testament period, a non-literary movement. It was only late that a literary period began with the Epistle to the Hebrews, which is a real Epistle, not a letter. Apart from this Epistle there is practically no theology in the New Testament. To speak of 'the theology of the New Testament' is an error. It is as false to speak of the theology of Paul. To draw a 'Paulinism' out of Paul is to turn what was living, hot, urgent religion into something dry and dead.

And this is the real ground on which the trustworthiness of the Gospels can be assured. It is not merely a question of historical science. Dr. Deissmann does not undervalue this. He has a lecture on it. But he asserts that, even on historical grounds, the Gospels can vindicate themselves. And in this connexion he mentions an interesting fact. He had been studying Arrian's *Anabasis* of Alexander the Great, and Arrian wrote in the second century A.D. Between Alexander and his biographies lies a large space of time, while between Jesus and His biographies is a very short space indeed. Dr. Deissmann confesses that formerly, in his callow days, it was on facts like this that he relied for his belief in the historical worth of the Gospels. But to-day he has quite departed from that. He thinks the 'demonstration of the spirit' has even more to do with our assurance, or, as it might otherwise be put, the religious impression the facts make on us.

It is precisely at this point that the candid reader will be a little puzzled. Dr. Deissmann's science is 'liberal.' He says, for example, that a number of the miracle stories may be regarded as secondary, and that the Gospel of John is to be regarded as containing rather 'cult-tradition' than actual history, so far as a good part of it is concerned. But then, when the author comes to apply the religious test, he finds the Fourth Gospel of first-rate value. It contains a revelation of the living Christ. The Divine Word speaks in it. The *testimonium internum* restores to us what science seems to have taken away. We are reminded of Kant's removal of God on grounds of reason, and his restoration of God on moral grounds.

But these, though outstanding, are not the only themes discussed in this delightful volume. There are six lectures, two on the 'Origin of the New Testament,' one on 'The Language of the New Testament,' one on 'The New Testament in World History,' one on 'The Historical Value of the New Testament,' and the last on 'The Religious Value of the New Testament.' Those who know Dr. Deissmann's previous studies will find all the charm, the direct simplicity, the scientific faithfulness, and the deeply earnest religious spirit which make this writer so attractive and helpful. His new book will find a warm welcome among us, and it will help to show how one can be a critic, with perfect candour and knowledge, and at the same time a humble and devout believer in the Lord Jesus Christ.

NATURE AND PURPOSE.

Dr. James Young Simpson, Professor of Natural Science at New College, Edinburgh, and Trinity College, Glasgow, has published his Terry Lectures delivered at Yale in 1929 under the title *Nature: Cosmic, Human, and Divine* (Milford; 6s. net). The first lecture is mainly a cosmogonic survey, in which there is much useful up-to-date information regarding the stellar universe. The second lecture is mainly an anthropological survey, equally informative, giving recent data and theories as to man's origin and destiny. There is an interesting discussion as to whether the Golden Age does not lie behind, and may not be recaptured once more. The third lecture is philosophical rather than scientific in its emphasis. It views the world of inorganic and organic nature as the sphere of manifestation of an Infinite Energy. But Nature thus Divine, though describable, is not explainable in mechanical terms. The category of Purpose is needed for its explanation, and Purpose spells in this reference God. Accordingly, Nature Divine points to Divine Nature. Here the Christian assertion, that God is love, is considered. Here also the doctrine of the Logos, taken by itself as affirming Mind in Nature, is declared to be a satisfactory philosophy of the universe: indeed, there is none more so. With the aid of the idea of a progressive Incarnation the author is led to say that 'Nature is not merely fulfilled in grace, but is, because of her unity throughout, the vehicle of grace.'

Dr. Simpson's writings gain in power and precision as he goes on; and as his challenges to traditional theology become more insistent, they become at the same time more pointed. Thus what he has to say regarding the Dogma of Original Sin is well and pertinently said, but we are not sure that he is sound in his Pauline exegesis (Ro 5^{12}). We are grateful to him, however, for an attractive and stimulating book.

NEW TESTAMENT PROBLEMS.

This admirable and most suggestive volume, *New Testament Problems*, consisting of a series of twenty-three essays on New Testament and patristic subjects, is culled from the private journal of the Editorial Secretary of the S.P.C.K., the Rev. W. K. Lowther Clarke, D.D. (S.P.C.K.; 7s. 6d. net). Some of these essays have already appeared in theological periodicals, including THE EXPOSITORY TIMES, but we are profoundly grateful to the author for collecting them with additional matter in this delightful form. The book is dedicated in a preface of singular felicity to the venerable scholar, Dr. Foakes-Jackson, a worthy tribute by a grateful pupil gracefully offered to a worthy teacher.

Each essay is complete in itself, and the range of topics is truly amazing. There is nothing dull or heavy in these pages. In every page we meet scholarship and living suggestiveness. Here we have the latest speculations on the Virgin Birth, an adequate discussion on the 'Formgeschichtlich' method of gospel criticism which seems to antiquate much of our current literary criticism of the sources; Edward Meyer's views on the origins of Christianity, and other articles dealing with current New Testament problems. There are delightful pieces of exegesis, such as, to take one example, that on Mk 10^{13-16}, which if it is not true, one feels in reading as if it ought to be. The essays XX. and XXI.—'The Early History of the Eucharist' and 'Confession to Laymen'—reveal the writer's patristic scholarship, where he has already won his spurs. The writer in the last essay—'May we expect a Religious Revival?'—is not afraid to prophesy, and though he bases his prediction on somewhat ancient and doubtful history, we love him for it—for here the wish is father to the thought, and the prophetic urge is prior to, and perhaps better than, the reasoning on which it is apparently based. This is one of the most suggestive books dealing with technical problems which we have had for many a day.

THE DIDASCALIA.

Didascalia Apostolorum (Milford; 18s. net) is a handsome volume, doing credit to the publisher, and a scholarly volume too, doing credit to its learned editor, the Rev. R. Hugh Connolly, O.S.B., of Downside Abbey. It contains a translation from the Syriac version, accompanied by the Verona Latin Fragments, and supplied with an elaborate introduction and many footnotes, of a third-century work, of which the original Greek text is lost. Written in Syria or Palestine, this has been characterized by Dr. Hans Achelis, the writer who has given us the fullest and most careful study of it, as providing us with more detailed information than any other Christian writing concerning the life, in all its aspects, of an early Christian community.

Until this edition appeared, the student who would find his way to the complete document required, in default of a knowledge of the Syriac language, to use modern translations, the French of Mgr. Nau, the German of Dr. Flemming, or the English (incomplete and based on a second-rate manuscript) of Mrs. Dunlop Gibson. Those who desire to reconstruct as much as may be recovered of the author's Greek must still be referred to Funk's edition of the 'Apostolic Constitutions,' where much of the preliminary work is already done, but the present editor warns them that for the remainder of their task they will find it necessary to use the Syriac and the (fragmentary) Latin versions. The present translation is based chiefly on the text of the Codex Sangermanensis, the oldest authority for the Syriac version, belonging probably to the eighth or ninth century.

The *Didascalia* (it would likely have been named *Didache*, but that this title—the more obvious word for 'doctrine'—was already in requisition for an older work) has been naturally classed with that family of documents which we know as the Church Orders, thus forming a third in point of time with the 'Didache' and the 'Apostolic Tradition' of Hippolytus. But the author comes before us neither as a theologian nor as a canonist; his interest is engaged with personal conduct and with ecclesiastical discipline in its wider practical bearing. The work may be more truly described with the present editor as an elementary treatise on Pastoral Theology.

There is much of human interest to be found in its pages, not to speak of the vivid picture it undoubtedly presents of early Church life. It is very elaborate on the office of the bishop, but we should like to conclude this notice by quoting from its instructions to the order of widows: 'Those who are gadabouts and without shame, cannot be still even in their houses; for they are no widows but wallets (*μὴ χήραι ἀλλὰ πήραι*), and they care for nothing else but to be making ready to receive. . . . And, moreover, she who has received an alms of the Lord—being without sense, in that she discloses (the matter) to her that asks her—has revealed and declared the name of the giver; and the other, hearing it, murmurs, and finds fault with the bishop who has dispensed, or with the deacon, or with him who has made some gift, saying: "Knewest thou not that I was nearer to thee and in more distress than she?"'

SERMONS.

We have picked out the five best volumes of Sermons that have reached us within the last few weeks. They are *An Apology for Rogues*, by the Rev. James Black, D.D. (Hodder & Stoughton; 7s. 6d. net); *Life Indeed*, by the Rev. Harold E. Brierley (T. & T. Clark; 7s. net); *From Chaos to God*, by Archdeacon F. B. Macnutt (James Clarke; 6s. net); *Sermons and Lectures*, by the late Chancellor E. R. Bernard (Cambridge University Press; 6s. net); and *The Glory of Going On*, by the Reverend R. Moffat Gautrey (Epworth Press; 3s. net).

A sermon from each of these volumes will be found in an abridged form in 'The Christian Year'—four in 'The Christian Year' for this month, and the fifth (Archdeacon Macnutt) in that for last month. In this way readers may compare the sermons for themselves. Dr. Black's volume differs from the others, because it contains character sketches. The book, he says, is 'a plea for a revaluation, long overdue, of some of the outstanding characters of the Bible who have been immemorially criticised or condemned.' The other four volumes, it is interesting to note, have each a sermon on death and immortality. Two, curiously enough, include a sermon with the title 'The Motherhood of God.'

Dr. Black, in his introduction, says: 'I believe that many of our ideas of historical characters, especially Biblical characters, have come to us at second-hand. Indeed, not a few of our popular judgments have been accepted unthinkingly, as an heirloom from a more prejudiced and less historical age. . . . In regard to the title of my book, I should like to say that I use the term "rogue" . . . rather as a modern gardener employs it to describe *outré* specimens among his flowers.' Cain, Esau, Korah, Saul, Jezebel, Gehazi, Pontius Pilate, Ananias, Demas, and others become startlingly akin to ourselves as their motives and circumstances are analysed. 'Yes, that is right,' we say, 'that is the real man.' All the sketches are suggestive. We have quoted 'An Apology for Cain.'

'The Divine Worker' is a good example of Mr. Brierley's work, though not in any other way surpassing the other eighteen studies, all of which are outstanding. They are full of thought, and will be found to repay close study—they are, perhaps, not always easy reading. Mr. Brierley's mind is steeped in the results of modern scientific research, and he makes excellent use of his knowledge in these sermons. He 'welcomes all the facts of modern knowledge.'

There is a leading idea running through Archdeacon Macnutt's *From Chaos to God*. How far, he asks, have Church and nation travelled in the post-war years along the road out of chaos? And the message is that the only way of escape lies along the way to God. There is an attractive directness in Archdeacon Macnutt's style, and he has a wealth of illustration. It has not been possible to show this fully in the sermon quoted, as it had to be shortened.

In 1921 Edward Russell Bernard died. For a number of years he was Chancellor of Salisbury Cathedral, but latterly he gave up all offices, although he continued to preach, and his message never lost its force. The present volume contains sermons and lectures selected from the whole course of his ministry. When Chancellor Bernard's love of the classics and his classical training—he was a Fellow of Magdalen College—are remembered, some of the distinctive notes in his preaching are explained. They are its restraint and the beauty of its language. 'On pleasing God' is the sermon we have chosen for 'The Christian Year.' It gives a good idea of the book as a whole.

Mr. Gautrey's *The Glory of Going On* is slighter than the other volumes, but it contains twelve sermons. They have been preached at widely separated intervals, but they do not lack cohesion. Can they do so, the author asks, if Christ be the theme? Mr. Gautrey is a master of the short and pithy sentence. Here is an example: 'Never be ashamed to pray. It is the hall-mark stamped upon our poor humanity. It is our chief certificate of sonship with God. Only as you pray can you come to the fullness of the stature of your manhood.'

Basic Beliefs (Abingdon Press; $1.50) is a new work by Dr. H. Maldwyn Hughes, President of Wesley College, Cambridge, England. It may be regarded as an Introduction to Christian Doctrine, treating as it does systematically and successively the great fundamental convictions of the Christian faith. The treatment is on popular lines, so that the work is more suited to the requirements of the preacher or Bible Class teacher than to those of the theological student. But President Hughes is obviously well read in technical theology, and his work is a sound and competent exposition of the various Christian doctrines from a modern evangelical standpoint. It is rich in Scriptural references. It is tolerant in spirit. If it is in places non-committal, and in other places inclined to skip over difficulties, these things may be pardoned in view of the nature of the treatment and the limitations of its scope.

The Bible and the Immortality of Man, by the Rev. A. Wiseman, M.A. (Allenson; 7s. 6d. net), is obviously the product of much and prolonged study. Whether that study has been always well directed is another matter. It hardly seems necessary for the writer to encumber his theme at the outset with fifty pages of argument with the evolutionists over the first chapters of Genesis. Nor does it seem relevant to devote the closing fifty pages to discussion about the millennium and kindred matters in the Apocalypse. The writer's attitude to Scripture is quite uncritical, and his line of argument is not likely to convince the unbelieving. Yet it should be understood that the book contains much sound Christian teaching on the great problems connected with man's duty and destiny.

This small volume, *The Intuition of God: An Introduction to the Philosophy of Mysticism*, by Mr. T. M. Watt, M.A.(Aberdeen), M.A.(Oxon.), comprising the Hastie Lectureship delivered at Glasgow in 1927, is worth its weight in gold (Blackwood; 5s. net). The style is excellent and the substance is even better. There are four lectures on 'Intuition and Reason,' 'Psychology and Religious Experience,' 'The Question of the Non-Rational in Religion,' and 'Christian Mysticism and Theology.' In each of these we have a positive contribution to theology. Nowhere have we seen in small compass a better discussion on the attitude of the 'religious' psychologists who would explain religion away than here. It will be read with appreciation in America, where the views of Professor Leuba are widely canvassed. We commend heartily the discussion of Otto's views, for this writer has surely a truer understanding of his position than is found, say, in

Dr. Strachan's recent book, 'The Authority of Christian Experience.' This is the first book by Mr. Watt we have seen—we hope it will not be the last.

To his valuable series of short commentaries on the Old Testament the Rev. Canon Sell, D.D., of Madras, has now added two small, but useful volumes, obtainable from the Church Missionary Society, London—one on *The Messianic Hope* (9d.), and the other on *Sin* (8d.). These books are marked by the same extensive command of the Biblical material and the same acquaintance with the literature relevant to the topics in question as characterize his commentaries. In the former volume the Messianic Hope is sketched from its adumbrations in the Mosaic age through the undivided kingdom right on through the centuries to its fulfilment in Christ, who in His own person gathered up all the aspirations of the past. The contributions to the Messianic idea offered by the psalmists, the prophets, and the apocalyptic writers are briefly but carefully considered. We are glad to note that he has not ignored the Samaritan idea of the Messiah, which regards Him as the Restorer and the Prophet 'who will tell us all things' (Jn 4^{25}).

The volume on *Sin* deals in succession with these topics—the nature of sin, the Jewish view of sin, the Law and sin, sin and death, Satan and sin, and God's remedy for sin. Dr. Sell, who is an authority on Arabic, enriches his discussion by allusions to the Muhammadan conception. The Qur'an, he tells us, denounces disobedience and other forms of sin, but it nowhere speaks of the need of a broken and contrite heart. It is interesting to find that he believes in the personality of Satan, 'whose one aim is to stir up any evil propensity within us to active revolt against the laws of God, and to exercise over us the "power of death."' The Appendix offers a useful compendium of the principal Greek, Hebrew, and Arabic words for sin, carefully discriminating between the various words.

Simultaneously there has appeared from the indefatigable pen of Dr. Sell a volume on *The 'Ayyub and Mamluk Sultans* (C.M.S.; 1s. 9d.) who reigned during the most brilliant period of Egyptian history, from A.D. 1171 to 1517. It is by no means a uniformly edifying story. The Sultans were often men of great ability, and they did much to encourage architecture, poetry, music, and the decorative arts, but the brilliance of their record is stained by much vindictive and wanton cruelty. Dr. Sell's pages form a reliable guide to the tortuous history of those three and a half centuries, his brief account of which furnishes a useful approach to the more elaborate histories of that important period.

One is very often asked to recommend a really good book upon Christian Ethics, and the answer is not always easy. Works, of course, there are in plenty, from mere booklets like Ernest Scott's thought-stirring little essay on 'The Ethical Teaching of Jesus' to the rounded fullness of, say, Haering's 'The Ethics of the Christian Life'; and the stream of them keeps running with an ever-stronger current. Yet the book for which one waits delays its coming, and no field lies opener to the advent of a satisfying masterpiece. Meanwhile here is a competent introduction in the Baird Lectures of the Rev. George Walker, D.D.—*The Idealism of Christian Ethics* (T. & T. Clark; 7s. net). It has all the characteristics of its author. Well informed, open-minded, balanced, moving forward steadily even in places where a foot can very easily slip, and never overpressing any of its points, it is a workmanlike and a trustworthy bit of scholarship. Opening, as is natural, with a study of the scope and the postulates of Christian Ethics, it deals in turn with the self-realization of the individual who has adopted this standard, the social claims of life upon him, a detailed description of the character required of him, and so, since Christian Ethics is no mere discussion of the Good and the Ideal, but the offer of a Power to lift the poorest creature up to that, to a final chapter on 'The Christian Dynamic and Motive.'

That is a well-trodden road. But it runs through interesting country, and to very splendid goals; and who so cares to take it with him will find in Dr. Walker a sagacious and interesting guide. It is not easy to name any of the burning moral problems of the day that are not dealt with, sometimes quite briefly, often much more exhaustively, by a dispassionate and thoughtful mind.

'The world is sick and in need of a physician, and we know that there is still available for it the healing of the great Physician which waits only on the confession of our disability and our faith.' These words occur in an excellent book on *Psychology and Religious Experience*, by Professor W. F. Halliday, M.A. (Hodder & Stoughton; 8s. 6d. net). Professor Halliday writes mainly for the guidance of Christian ministers, but he has given us an able treatise on the relation of the New Psychology to religion. The treatment is eminently sane throughout, and not least in the steady insistence on personal inward sincerity as the indispensable precondition of all helpful dealing with others. Strong emphasis is laid on the importance of the home, and there is much here to guide parents in the education of their children as well as the Christian pastor in his cure of souls.

The Ingersoll Lecture for 1929 has been published under the title of *Man's Consciousness of Immortality*, by the Rev. W. Douglas Mackenzie, D.D., LL.D. (Harvard University Press; 4s. 6d. net). The fundamental thesis of the lecture is stated thus: 'The idea of immortality, the belief in personal survival, has entered as an inherent, essential, ineradicable element into every phase of human experience from the beginning; it has contributed certain qualities to the entire reflective life of man, without which that life, as we know it, would have been impossible.' Leaving aside the usual arguments for immortality, President Mackenzie shows impressively that 'humanity has made its history in and through the consciousness of immortality.' He has given us in this lecture a piece of fresh and original work.

Some excellent volumes of sermons to children have come together. It is difficult to say which of them is best. They are all by well-known men, and each is attractive in its own way. Perhaps the first place may be given to *Nuts and Nut-Crackers, and Other Parables for Children*, by the Rev. R. E. Thomas, M.A. (Independent Press; 2s. 6d. net). The addresses are not all parables, but they are all fresh and interesting. This book has been 'tried on the dog,' and the verdict of a fourteen-year-old is enthusiastically favourable. *Lamps and Lamplighters*, by the Rev. John Macbeath, M.A. (Carey Press; 2s. 6d. net), makes a good second. It is beautifully got up, and its subjects are attractive and well-handled. 'Hats Off!' 'Coats Off!' Fans, Mats, Mascots, and what not, give Mr. Macbeath his opportunity, and he uses it well. *The Boys and Girls of the Bible*, by the Rev. A. D. Belden of Whitefield's Tabernacle (Allenson; 2s. 6d. net), deals with a series which every minister has wished sometimes to handle under such experienced and skilful guidance as the well-known minister of Whitefield's can give; there will be no lack of ability to handle it now. The addresses are short and pointed, and all the boys and girls are ticked off with a title that sums up their quality. Finally, *The Singing Grasshopper*, by the Rev. Gordon Carmichael, M.A., B.D. (Allenson; 3s. 6d. net), has a characteristic of its own. The author spent years in South Africa, and he has used his experiences there to good purpose in illustrating his talks to children. There are forty-two of them, and they will be found good.

To write the history of the Church in one volume of some five hundred pages is a difficult task. The Rev. C. P. S. Clarke, M.A., has attempted it, and done it well. Proportion is kept, and the most important movements receive due attention. It is not a dry catalogue of events. It is a most readable and interesting narrative. We cordially recommend the volume to students and to the general reader, both of whom will profit from its perusal—*Short History of the Christian Church from the Earliest Times to the Present Day* (Longmans; 10s. 6d. net).

Dr. Morgan, who till lately was Chief of the Training College for Teachers in Edinburgh, has followed up his excellent history of the 'Rise and Progress of Scottish Education' with a fascinating book on *Makers of Scottish Education* (Longmans; 5s. net). These studies are probably the overspill from his previous more elaborate survey, and they are all of them intensely interesting. Dr. Morgan has cast his net wide, and has included in the 'makers' of education not only scholars and teachers, but administrators and also benefactors. As a result we have charming sketches of George Heriot, Daniel Stewart, and a host of other wealthy merchant princes who devoted much of their fortunes to the founding of educational institutions that are still famous. The last section of the book deals with well-known educationists like Professor Laurie, Sir Henry Craik, Sir John Struthers, and Lord Haldane. Dr. Morgan has many amusing and significant stories to tell of his worthies, but, while giving their human side an engaging prominence, he never loses sight of what they did for the youth of their land. This is a delightfully interesting book that will appeal to all patriotic Scotsmen, and to all anywhere who value educational ideals.

It is a pleasure to commend in the strongest terms *The School Bible: Being Selections from the Text of the Authorized Version* (Nelson; 2s. net). It has been recognized recently that the form in which the Bible is presented to children militates against its acceptance by them. The double columns, the bad print, the conventional binding, the chapters and verses, all remove the Bible so far from ordinary experience that the child has no liking for it. Consequently, attempts have been made to present to children a Bible more like their ordinary books, well-printed, attractively bound, with headings instead of chapters, without verses, and, finally, omitting much that is uninteresting and unnecessary. The Cambridge Press led the way, Mr. Mee produced an excellent book, the Nelsons themselves issued an edition in six volumes. Only one thing was against these admirable efforts; they were too dear. But now we have this beautiful little book, with all that is essential, well-printed, arranged with suitable headings, light to handle, and only two shillings! This is a really fine achievement, and ought to be rewarded with a large sale. One special feature of this edition, absent from all the others, is that the relevant parts of the Prophets are printed, not separately, but in their place in the history, so that you read about Assyria in Kings, and then, alongside of this, what Isaiah has to say about it. We wish this admirable book a great success.

On the Track of the Prodigal, by the Rev. Julian Harvey (Skeffington; 2s. net), contains ten very simple and straight talks on the principal episodes of the Prodigal's career. There is no detailed exegesis, but the writer makes each text a peg on which to hang a number of shrewd observations and wise Christian counsels. The style is conversational, and pleasantly brightened by apt quotation and anecdote.

Short Addresses after Evensong, vol. i., edited by the Rev. John H. Burn, B.D. (Skeffington; 6s. net), is a volume of fully fifty sermons by various clergymen of the Church of England, arranged for Sundays, Festivals, and Fasts throughout the Christian Year. The quality, of course, varies, but the general level is high, and the book should prove most suggestive to preachers who follow the course of the Christian Year. A curious feature of the book is that, by way of introduction, there is a passionate attack on 'ecclesiastical bureaucracy,' as it operates in the Church of England. The relevance of this to the sermons which follow is not apparent, though we may perhaps take it that the various writers are in sympathy with the protest.

It has been remarked in these columns before now that there is a dearth in our midst of reliable information as to the venerable Church of the East. Here is a splendid book—precisely what we have been searching for—*The Eastern Orthodox Church*, by Stephan Zankov (S.C.M.; 5s. net). The author is the Professor of Ecclesiastical Law in Sofia, who speaks with full knowledge. His work has been translated by Mr. D. A. Lowrie. It is not a lengthy exposition of the Creed, the Polity, the Worship, and the Piety of the Eastern Church; but it gives sufficient under each of those heads to enable us to have some real and true conception of the long-isolated and little-known Eastern Communion.

Christian Convictions, by the Rev. George Barclay, M.A. (S.C.M.; 3s. net), consists of a short series of articles which appeared originally in 'The Student Movement.' They treat of such topics as Life and Creed, Belief in God, Jesus the Son of God, the Death of Jesus. Though brief, they are really excellent. If one wished to put into the hands of a young student a short summary of Christian truth, it would be difficult to find anything more admirably fitted to the purpose than this.

The Art of Living, by the Rev. J. W. Coutts, M.A. (S.C.M.; 4s. net), is a book to be placed in the hands of youth. It is full of wisdom and humanity, humour, and insight. The writer has a competent knowledge of the best psychology, but never obtrudes this. Indeed, there is more sound psychology in his genial pages than in most works of professional psychologists, but you would hardly guess, unless you read between the lines, how extensive his reading has been. The book is divided into two parts, one dealing with 'Principles,' the other with 'Practice.' In the former we have discussions of conscience, habits, 'that queer mixture—human nature,' 'Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde,' with unconventional and well-illustrated talks about life and its problems. In the latter we have chapters on 'Husbands and Wives' (a frank and searching treatment), 'Parents and Children,' 'The Use of Leisure,' 'Some Common Faults with Great Consequences,' and 'On Growing Old.' The whole book is refreshing. It is thoroughly human, wise, and helpful.

◆

The Contribution of the United States of America to Old Testament Scholarship.

By Professor J. M. Powis Smith, The University of Chicago.

It should not surprise any one to learn that the contribution of the United States to learning and to literature was rather slow in beginning. The first century in the new country was taken up with the elemental struggle for existence. Indians had to be fought, the prairies had to be broken, *i.e.* converted from grassland into ploughed land, houses had to be built, fences had to be erected, schools and colleges had to be established, railways and telegraph lines had to be laid out and constructed, rivers had to be bridged, roads had to be made, and state and national governments had to be organized and maintained. In a word, the foundations of a civilization had to be laid. Not only so, but three great wars had to be fought. Little wonder that with all this going on there was little time for scholarly or artistic work.

Naturally, therefore, the history of Old Testament scholarship on this side of the water is not very long. The first work of significance was that of Charles A. Briggs, entitled *Biblical Study* (1884); this was published in a new and enlarged edition in 1899. It was followed by his *Messianic Prophecy* (1886). These were not revolutionary works, and displayed little sense of a genuinely historical attitude, but they opened the way for the work of other scholars. Professor Briggs' most valuable work was in a series of articles published in *Hebraica*, vol. iii. (1886), in which he did creative work on the structure of Hebrew poetry. He also rendered useful service as editor, with Francis Brown and S. R. Driver, of the *Hebrew Lexicon of the Old Testament* (finished in 1906), which has been of invaluable assistance to all students of Hebrew. Besides this, he shared with S. R. Driver the Old Testament editorship of the 'International Critical Commentary,' not yet finished. Under the leadership of C. A. Briggs and Francis Brown, Union Theological Seminary in New York City took position as one of the leading institutions representing the modern historical point of view in Biblical Criticism. The 'International Critical Commentary' has enlisted the service of the leading English-speaking scholars and is regarded as on the whole the most authoritative work of its nature in English upon the Old Testament. Of the seventeen volumes on the Old Testament so far issued, twelve have been prepared by American scholars, viz. *Judges*, by George F. Moore (1895); *Samuel*, by H. P. Smith (1899); *Proverbs*, by C. H. Toy (1899); *Amos and Hosea*, by W. R. Harper (1905); *Psalms*, by Charles A. Briggs and Emilie Grace Briggs (1906); *Ecclesiastes*, by George A. Barton (1908); *Esther*, by L. B. Paton (1908); *Chronicles*, by E. L. Curtis and A. A. Madsen (1910); *Micah, Zephaniah, Nahum, Habakkuk, Obadiah, and Joel*, by J. M. Powis Smith, W. H. Ward, and Julius A. Bewer (1912); *Haggai, Zechariah, Malachi, and Jonah* by H. G. Mitchell, J. M. Powis Smith, and J. A. Bewer (1912); *Ezra-Nehemiah*, by L. W. Batten (1913); and *Daniel*, by J. A. Montgomery (1927). These men were all professors in universities or theological seminaries, and represent all the leading schools of the country, thus showing that the historical method of Biblical study has won its way throughout the country. Not that there are not movements of opposition to progress here as elsewhere, but such movements are doomed to failure, and already show signs of their weakness.

One of the most active and effective exponents of the modern point of view in Biblical study was my own great teacher, President William Rainey Harper, of the University of Chicago. He was a most inspiring teacher and a great organizer. He awakened a new interest in Old Testament study all over the country. He introduced a new method for the teaching of Hebrew, viz. the Inductive Method, and established summer schools of Hebrew at Chautauqua and many other centres. He founded the popular journal known as *The Biblical World*, which continued to represent sound Biblical views and to keep alive an interest in the subject until it passed out of existence in 1920. He also established a technical journal, first published in 1884, and called *Hebraica*, and later changed to *The American Journal of Semitic Languages and Literatures*, under which title it still exists, being now in its forty-fifth volume. He likewise founded a Department of Semitic Languages and Literatures in the University of Chicago, which at once took leading rank in American Old Testament scholarship. Under its present Chairman, Professor James Henry Breasted, it has expanded into a larger organization, known as the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago, which is conducting excavations and research in the Orient in connexion with six expeditions. From these operations much advantage should accrue to Old Testament scholarship.

Other names that have bulked large in American Old Testament scholarship should be mentioned. Among these belongs the name of Professor George Foot Moore of Harvard University, who has been a leading light for decades. He rendered yeoman service to Old Testament studies in early days by his commentary on Judges and by numerous articles. In later years he has been working more in the history of religions, especially Judaism. Alongside of him should be named the late Professor Paul Haupt of Johns Hopkins University, whose Polychrome Bible brought modern criticism vividly to the mind of both critic and layman through its gaily coloured English and Hebrew volumes. Another of that same generation was Professor Crawford Howell Toy, also of Harvard University, whose careful scholarship and open mind commended him to scholars and pupils alike. His *Proverbs* is still a standard work upon that book, and his article on 'Ecclesiastes,' which I have recently had the privilege of revising, is included in the fourteenth edition of the *Encyclopedia Britannica.* Along with these belongs also the name of the late Henry Preserved Smith of Union Theological Seminary, New York. He has left for the edification of his successors a volume on *The Religion of Israel* (1914), and another on *Old Testament History* (1903), both of which are standard works, though now in need of revision. Besides these, there was recently published the story[1] of the attack made upon him when he was professor in Lane Theological Seminary, Cincinnati, for the purpose of removing him from his chair because of his modern views. We of the present day owe a great debt to men like Briggs and H. P. Smith, who fought bravely for the principles so vital to them, thus easing the path for us who follow.

No list of Old Testament scholars would be complete without the name of C. C. Torrey, of Yale University. His work would be classified as radical, since in dealing with Ezra, Nehemiah, and Deutero-Isaiah, he seeks the overthrow of generally accepted positions, making this literature much later than other scholars do. But even if his views do not stand, such work is valuable in that it stirs scholars in general to a fresh examination of their conclusions and frequently leads to some modification of accepted results.

Jewish Old Testament scholarship is well represented by three names, those of the late Morris Jastrow, Junr., of President Julian Morgenstern of the Hebrew Union College in Cincinnati, and of Professor Moses Buttenwieser, of the same institution. Jastrow wrote useful commentaries on Job and Ecclesiastes. Morgenstern is working on the problem of Pentateuchal Criticism, articles upon which by him frequently appear; and Buttenwieser has done good work on the Prophets and on Job.

One special study now in progress should be mentioned, viz. the Peshitto project being carried on by Professors Martin Sprengling and William C. Graham of the University of Chicago. Its ultimate aim is to establish a sound text of the Peshitto, or Syriac translation of the Old Testament. At present, the Syriac commentaries on the Old Testament by Bar Hebraeus and Bar Salibi are being translated for the purpose of establishing the Syriac text upon which their commentaries were based. The first volume of this work is nearly ready for the press. The work is being financed by the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago. This undertaking should be a great contribution toward the establishment of a critically based standard Hebrew text of the Old Testament.

Meantime, mention may be made of the *American Translation of the Old Testament,* published by the University of Chicago Press, and made under the editorship of J. M. Powis Smith by four translators, viz. Professors T. J. Meek, A. R. Gordon, L. W. Waterman, and J. M. Powis Smith. It is to be hoped that this may, at least, make some contribution toward the better translation that the future has in store.

American Old Testament scholars also made a considerable contribution toward the preparation of Hastings' *Dictionary of the Bible.* To that work about sixty articles were contributed by Americans, not counting minor articles. Likewise the American Society of Biblical Literature publishes a journal, now in its forty-eighth volume, which for nearly half a century has afforded Old Testament scholars an opportunity to get their results before the reading world. The maintenance of the American School for Oriental Research in Jerusalem, Palestine, must also be credited to the account of American Biblical scholars. This school serves as a centre for young scholars from which they can become acquainted with the geography of Palestine, study questions of identification of localities, gain some feeling for Semitic psychology, realize the economic limitations of life in Palestine, and so become more capable of understanding and interpreting the Biblical literature.

---

[1] H. P. Smith, *The Heretic's Defense: A Footnote to History* (1926).

In summing up the value of the American contribution to Old Testament scholarship, it may be confidently said that America has brought to Old Testament studies a spirit of enthusiasm and an attitude of freedom that have been of great value. In this new land, tradition has lost some of its power. We have, therefore, been able to look at Biblical problems with free and unfettered minds, thus seeing more clearly and deeply than would otherwise have been possible. From that point of view, the future is encouraging. The advocates of tradition are not yet by any means silent; but the modern historical point of view is established in practically all the schools of higher learning, and is fast gaining the confidence of the educated public. Hence we can look forward with confidence to a free field wherein we shall have liberty to interpret the Word of God in accordance with the dictates of reason and intelligence and under the guidance of a free conscience.

In the Study.

Virginibus Puerisque.

Seals.

By the Reverend E. A. Payne, B.A., B.D., B.Litt., Bugbrooke, Northampton.

'The seal of mine apostleship are ye.'—1 Co 9².

Not long ago, as you will all know, there was a change of Government in this country. Those who had been in charge of affairs for the last five years resigned, and others took their places. According to the newspapers, one day early in June all the members of the old Cabinet went in their best suits and top hats, and by special train, to see the King at Windsor, and they gave up to him the seals of their various offices. Then a day or so later all who were to be members of the new Cabinet, in their best clothes (there was one lady, so they had not all top hats this time) and again by special train, went down to Windsor and received the seals from His Majesty. Until they had the seals, they were not really the King's Ministers. The old seals are the sign of authority. They show that the members of the Cabinet have power from the King to act on his behalf. Orders which bear the mark of these seals must be obeyed.

Seals are among the oldest things in the world. Sometimes they have been big and elaborate, sometimes quite small and very finely wrought. Sometimes men have worn them hung round the neck by a cord, sometimes as a ring on the finger. Centuries ago in Babylon official documents were sealed with a marked cylinder. The Egyptians used little models of beetles. Most museums in this country have collections of old seals of all shapes and sizes. Everywhere they have been used to give authority to those who possessed them, and to prove that papers marked with them are really genuine.

There is a story about a seal in the Old Testament. King Ahab wanted a vineyard which was near his palace, but Naboth, the owner, would not part with it because it was a family possession and had belonged to his father and his grandfather before him. Unfortunately, the wicked queen Jezebel discovered the King's wish, and so she planned to get Naboth out of the way. She sent letters in the King's name ordering Naboth to be stoned, and the letters were obeyed, because she had stolen the King's seal to put on them, and when people saw the seal they were sure this cruel deed must have been ordered by Ahab and must be carried out. Since the seal was there all right no one questioned that the letters were genuine.

There is something about seals in the New Testament also. The Apostle Paul writing to the Christians in Corinth says that they are the seals set upon his preaching; they show that he really has authority from God; they are the sign that he is a true apostle; they are the proof of the power of the gospel. When those in Corinth saw the changed lives of Paul's friends, then they could be sure that he had the right to speak about Jesus Christ. When the other Apostles heard of these Corinthian Christians, they had to recognize Paul as properly accredited. You can be seals in that sense. If you live truthful, clean, and helpful lives, then the boys and girls you meet at school will know that there is real power and authority in the gospel which you hear at Sunday School and in Church. They will attend to the message of Jesus Christ because they will see that it has its seals attached to it all right.

A Moderate Southerly Wind.

By the Reverend T. Greener Gardner, Blackburn.

'When the south wind blew softly.'—Ac 27[13].

Sir Herbert Tree once asked a gipsy how he decided which direction to take when he moved camp. The gipsy replied, 'I turn my back to the wind.' To those people who desire an easy vagabond sort of life that might sound like good philosophy, but to those who have to deal with young people, it sounds like a dangerous philosophy. No one giving advice to boys and girls would tell them always to turn their backs to the wind; they would rather say that oftentimes the only way to make life worth while is to face the wind, to battle with opposing forces, and if possible to make opposing forces friends rather than enemies.

I remember once being in a sailing-boat in one of England's most famous harbours. With our party there was a 'son of the sea,' a man who had spent years on board ship. We were sailing beautifully with the wind, and I, an ignorant landsman, ventured to say, 'This is all right, but we have to come back again, how are we to manage it?' The sailor replied, 'We'll make the same wind bring us back again.' And so with movement of sail, he started to 'tack'—that's what he called it—and we went from one side of the harbour to the other, gaining a little distance each time, until eventually we landed at the point where we had started. The wind was against us, but its power was harnessed for our service. If we had kept our backs to the wind, we should have gone far out to sea.

You have read the story of the moderate southerly wind, of which the Acts of the Apostles tells us, in the story of Paul's journey to Rome. Paul, drawing from his experience, told the sailors that they had better settle down a little and wait, but there came a moderate southerly wind, and tempted them to reject Paul's advice—they turned their backs to it; but before long it became a hurricane and overcame them, and they suffered shipwreck. Turning their back to the wind brought disaster to them.

You get another story in the New Testament. This time about Jesus. You remember that the disciples were very concerned about Jesus when He set out to go to Jerusalem for the last time. The disciples said to Him, 'Master, the Jews of late sought to stone thee, goest thou thither again?' But Jesus set His face like a flint to go to Jerusalem. He faced the wind and storm rather than turn His back to them, and because of what He did He became the world's Saviour and Friend.

Once when Dr. Livingstone was in Africa, being troubled with the threat of a hostile chief, he decided to pass over a river, out of the chief's territory, by night, and thus escape the danger of being shot down. But he had read in his New Testament that Jesus had said, 'Lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end,' and Dr. Livingstone said those were the words of the world's best gentleman, and He had never let any one down. It was cowardly to go by night and mistrust the word of Jesus—so he went by day, and his faith was verified. He did not turn his back to the wind—he faced what appeared like a storm and overcame it. Boys and girls, with a leader like Jesus, you need not be for ever deceived by the moderate southerly wind, and turn your back to it; it may become a hurricane you cannot turn round and face. You ought not to set out in life trying to find an easy path, but dare to go along the path which makes for life's best development, even when it means you set your face towards the wind.

The Christian Year.

SECOND SUNDAY AFTER EPIPHANY.

Like Perverse Children.

'Whereunto shall I liken this generation? It is like unto children sitting in the markets, and calling unto their fellows, And saying, We have piped unto you, and ye have not danced; we have mourned unto you, and ye have not lamented. For John came neither eating nor drinking, and they say, He hath a devil. The Son of man came eating and drinking, and they say, Behold a man gluttonous, and a winebibber, a friend of publicans and sinners.'—Mt 11[16-19].

In outline the picture is less distinct than in other parables, and it is not possible with certainty to decide who it is that gives the call. The order of the clauses would suggest that it is the people who grumbled because John and Jesus did not fall in with their suggestions. Let us play at a wedding! they said, and John sternly answered, This is no time for mirth; but next moment, in a mood of needless despondency, they were ready for a funeral, and were aggrieved that Jesus should not set His face with them to sadness. You are like children, said Jesus, with moods of unreasonable sanguineness and unreasonable depression; and you find fault with men who have some meaning in their temper, if they do not fall in with whims of yours. That is one way of reading the parable. It is more natural, however, to think of John and Jesus as taking the lead, making their proposals, and being met in turn with a sullen refusal. The uncertainty of reading may be deliberate, and Jesus may intend us to see in the parable the picture of a game at cross-purposes, where both parties wish to lead and neither will follow, where the people make it a grievance that the prophet does not share their humour, and the prophet laments because they will not hear his voice. The people exclaim, How eccentric and wilful are these preachers! and the preachers say, How sullen and unresponsive is this people! Each claims the right to call the tune, and is aggrieved because his plan is not followed. It is the breaking down of a game, a situation which is vexing in a company of children, but how inconceivably grave it is in a society of men and women! 'That generation has not passed away,' says Matthew Henry, 'but remains in a succession of the like;' and the society of our time also imagines that it has the right to say how men shall live, and dismisses as fanatical and eccentric any one who, for deeper reasons, holds to a path of his own. That spirit will never be wanting, or the sad game of cross-purposes to which it gives rise, so long as men are content so largely to be spectators in religion, and to know it only on the outside.

It is of this onlooker's view that we wish to speak.

1. And first, notice how much—or, rather, how little—a spectator in religion is able to see. Certainly he can note the superficial distinctions of parties, John's asceticism and Jesus' geniality, just as the Samaritan woman knew the alternatives of Gerizim or Jerusalem; but below the surface he does not care to go. For many years the Salvation Army was, to a host of people, nothing more than scoop-bonnets and tambourines, and the High Church was all incense and millinery. People said of John, 'He has a devil,' which, in our modern phrase, would be rendered—he is a hypochondriac, full of extravagant fancies. And of the Other, they said, 'He is a gluttonous man and a boon companion,' for that was all they could see in Jesus of Nazareth; and the nicknames serve to measure, not the men who bore them, but the unfathomable ignorance which is possible in the mere spectator. It is pathetic to note that in our classical novels the representation of religion is mainly of this sort; in Dickens, in Thackeray, even in Scott, any fervour of piety appears in the guise of caricature.

That is Christ's point against the spectators, who see the game but will not join in it. They can note the peculiarities of religious people; they can imitate the tones of preachers; they can listen to one appeal and then to another, but in their hearts they do not admit that this is a matter of personal concern, with which their life may be bound up.

What baffled Christ's contemporaries both in Him and in John was their air of aloofness. People thought them stubborn in not going with the crowd, in which they shared the common experience of original men of all degrees; for the impulse of a society is always to subdue and flatten down anything which is exceptional. It would like to trim Samson's shaggy locks and make him a little more like other people; for it does not understand that there are forces which inevitably isolate some men, and drive them along a path which is their own, so that, if they were brought to a tame conformity with their neighbours, it would be at the expense of their commission.

Think of Luther, resolute in not taking directions from the spirit of his age! He had heard God speaking in his heart, and he counted it his duty to attend to none besides. 'Here stand I, Martin Luther: I can do no other: so help me God!' His friends counted that magnificent; but the mere spectator smiled at the notion of any one's taking himself so fearfully in earnest. Why should you stand aloof? men said to John; why should your preaching be always on that key of threatening? There are surely other objects in the world than the lifted axe and the fruitless tree. They reckoned it mere whim in him, which he might have altered if he had cared. And why are you so very unconventional? they said to Jesus. These people you associate with are more than doubtful characters, and it is extremely imprudent for a religious teacher to be seen in such companionship. You have nobody but yourself to blame if your reputation suffers. Again they thought it wilfulness in Him, not discerning that His interest in the reckless and His geniality towards all men went to the very roots of His nature, so that He could not stand aloof if He were to remain Himself.

2. We have spoken of what these spectators could see, little though it was, but we must mention two great things in John's life and in Jesus' which they failed to see; the one of these was the secret of John's rigour, and the other of Christ's buoyancy of heart.

Nothing in life can be more enduringly impressive than such a revival as John inaugurated, when the eternal things come up before men and look near, so that they are driven to judge themselves and all they do as in that tremendous presence. Life at other times is so clamorous that we readily miss the still, small voice which summons us to duty. But, in a revival, men, over whole communities, may be carried beyond themselves, and think no longer of their impediments, but of the uniting necessity of a new life. John in his very figure and tone was an embodied admonition to his fellows: his look, his dress, the penetrating, shattering notes of his voice appealed to something lying deep within them. There was nothing abnormal in being moved by John, the abnormality was rather in those who remained unmoved. For in them also was the human heart which judges itself and accepts no plea; but the spectators' temper held them back.

But to the men of that generation there came another and a deeper word of God. In the world there is so much of sorrow and of gloom that a happy heart may be a boon to a whole society; and Jesus came not with the untroubled brightness of those who never wept, but with the surer light of men who have mastered every power of darkness. He knew pain, disappointment, weariness, indignation; but above all these He knew the love of God, and He was glad. He knew that in the end God must prevail, and that in His own coming a beginning of the end was made. And thus, because He believed and was sure, He banished gloom from His surroundings. His whole bearing, which was complained of, was an embodied gospel, a declaration that God is love and that His mercy has within it room for all His creatures. One might have fancied that this would be apparent even to outsiders; but all they did see was a jovial companion of loose characters, not seriously to be taken as a teacher of religion at all. That was the penalty they incurred by consenting to know religion only on the surface; they missed in John the warning and in Jesus the invitation of God.

There is a day when the attitude of the spectator is no longer possible, when men must deal with the realities and not with the appearances of religion. There is no man by the constitution of his being left an outsider, for 'there is a spirit in man, and the breath of the Almighty giveth him understanding.'[1]

Third Sunday after Epiphany.

Pioneers of Progress.

'Go through, go through the gates; prepare ye the way of the people; cast up, cast up the highway; gather out the stones; lift up a standard for the people.'—Is 62^{10}.

We must study contemporary history if we would truly understand the urgency of this appeal. Fifty years before, the city of Jerusalem had been besieged by the armies of Babylon, and for eighteen months the dreadful strife ceased neither day nor night. 'Upon the streets, the pining children, the stricken princes, the groups of men lean with hunger, the rotting heaps of slain, mothers feeding on the bodies of the infants whom their sapless breasts could no longer keep alive; by the walls, the hanging and crucifixion of multitudes with all the fashion of Chaldean cruelty; whilst upon the hills around the neighbouring tribes are gathered to jeer at the destruction of Jerusalem.' Such is the picture which Sir George Adam Smith has painted of this City of Dreadful Night. Then came the inevitable end. The inner gate yielded before the importunity of battle. The merciless foemen, exasperated by the stubbornness of the defenders, allowed their unbridled fury to do its worst.

The fate of the city found its parallel in the doom of her unhappy citizens. Multitudes were slain, whilst the remnant of the nation became the slaves of the invading host. Isaiah's prophecy of retribution had been at last fulfilled; the Exile was utterly and awfully complete. Thus there settled down upon Judah and Jerusalem the long dark night of a nation's doom, and for half a century no ray of light pierced the thick cloud of their captivity.

In their bondage the exiles learned that their sufferings were not an undeserved calamity. Beneath the stern yoke of the oppressor the majesty of conscience was restored, its function vindicated. Behind them lay the dark ages of delinquent history; and as they read the stained, polluted page penitence began its gracious work.

This was the point to which their captivity was designed to lead them; and, God's purpose having been accomplished, the period of their punishment must end. In the fortieth chapter a new note is heard in the stillness of the night. 'Comfort ye, comfort ye my people, saith your God. Speak ye home to the heart of Jerusalem, and cry unto her, that her warfare is accomplished, that her iniquity is pardoned.'

But scarcely has the voice of comfort ceased than another voice is heard. It is the call to service, to strenuous endeavour—'In the wilderness prepare ye the way of the Lord, make straight in the desert a highway for our God.' The prophet's eyes are lifted toward the far-off city of Jerusalem, and in thought he traverses the weary miles of wilderness that intervene. The returning hosts are not made up of mail-clad heroes flushed with the pride of victory. They are captives who have spent their strength in bitter servitude, weary mothers and helpless little children. Such a mixed multitude of feeble folk need adequate provision for their manifold infirmities.

---

[1] W. M. Macgregor, *Repentance unto Life*, 60.

And so with clarion tones the prophet bids the pioneers, 'Go through the gates; prepare ye the way of the people; cast up, cast up the highway; gather out the stones; lift up a standard for the people.' It is the appeal of God to all that is heroic in the nation's life. Only the stalwart souls, ready to do and dare, can obey the call.

Such was the call of God to the men of purpose in this crisis of a nation's history. And, ringing down through all the ages, the same call echoes to-day. To every man of clear conscience and conviction there comes the command of God, 'Go through, go through the gates; prepare ye the way of the people.' They are lifting weary eyes to the far-off city of God; but between them and that distant goal there looms the wilderness of sin, with its innumerable perils. Lift up a standard for the people that they be no longer leaderless. Rally the scattered forces which have been badly beaten in life's battle and tell them that the day is not lost. Sound the advance, for victory may yet be achieved in the name and strength of God.

Eyes rekindling, and prayers
Follow your steps as ye go.
Ye fill up the gaps in our files,
Strengthen the wavering line,
Stablish, continue our march,
On, to the bound of the waste,
On, to the City of God!

That is a modern rendering of the ancient battle-cry wherewith the prophet of the Lord inspired the heart of Israel. In response, enthusiastic sons of God have arisen to discharge the duty of the pioneers in preparing the way of the people. Are we not in danger of underestimating our indebtedness to the past? Our present position was not attained in a day. The priceless privileges we enjoy are the bequests of the generations which have preceded us.

And is it possible that we should stand aloof from the progress of the ages? Are we content to be carried as mere drift-wood on the surface of the tide? Shall we not rather join our strength to the forces that are in operation all around us, and bring what power we possess to bear upon the uplifting of the race?

Before us there are opportunities for service, possibilities of conquest the like of which the world has never seen before. The barrier of ancient customs must be broken down, the briars of temptation must be rooted out, and across the trackless bog of human misery we must build the highway of the Lord. Do we say it is impossible? That is precisely what they told George Stephenson when he proposed to build a railway from Liverpool to Manchester. Chat Moss was in the way, and the most expert engineers declared Chat Moss to be an insurmountable difficulty.

And as we look across the dark morass of human woe and sin and helplessness, when we take into consideration the frailty of human nature and its constant bias toward evil, we are sometimes tempted to believe that the path to heaven can never be constructed across the unstable waste of a sin-cursed world. 'It is impossible!' Yes! that has been the devil's cry through all the ages. Have we never read, 'With God all things are possible'? If we will but link our weakness on to God's omnipotence, that word 'impossible' may be erased from our vocabulary.

But that means work; for faith without works is dead. The impossible can only be accomplished by the men who pray as though the issue depended upon God, and work as though the issue depended upon themselves alone. For this purpose were we born into the world, that we might attempt great tasks and commit ourselves to a glorious crusade. Let us build a road by which it shall be easy for others to come again to Zion with songs and everlasting joy upon their heads. 'Gather out the stones' that hinder so many of our fellow-men from running the race set before them. Is it no reproach to us that there are thousands who stumble and fall over the stones which lust and greed have deliberately placed within their path? Surely it is one of the greatest anomalies of our modern civilization that the same legislature which punishes a man for getting drunk is responsible for putting up at each street corner an incitement to evil-doing. We must break down this tyranny of iniquity; we must sweep away the chronic evils and wrongs which have darkened the human mind and become the unmitigated curse of the human race. We can never cease from toil until public law and administration are on the side of private virtue and civic righteousness; until men shall find it easy to do right and difficult to do wrong.

'Lift up a standard for the people.' What standard can we raise, but the standard of the Cross. When the great French nation rose to the task of self-emancipation, they inscribed upon their banners 'Liberty, Equality, Fraternity,' and we are apt to forget that they are stolen words. They form an essential part of the gospel; and through the ages they have been the watchwords of Christianity. In lifting the banner of the Cross, we raise the standard of the brotherhood of man, of civic and religious liberty, of the glory and excellency of the Kingdom of our God and of His Christ; and round this thrice blessed banner we must rally the forces of the world and follow the flag to victory.[1]

For ever ours! for good or ill, on us the burden lies;
God's balance, watched by angels, is hung across the skies.
Shall Justice, Truth, and Freedom turn the poised and trembling scale?
Or shall the Evil triumph, and robber Wrong prevail?

. . . . . .

The day is breaking in the East of which the prophets told,
And brightens up the sky of Time the Christian Age of Gold;
Old Might to Right is yielding, battle blade to clerkly pen,
Earth's monarchs are her peoples, and her serfs stand up as men.

Fourth Sunday after Epiphany.

On Pleasing God.

'We labour, that, whether present or absent, we may be accepted of him.'—2 Co 5[9].

1. We *labour* to please Him. Let us get rid at once of the word 'labour.' It introduces the thought of painful, despondent effort. That is not St. Paul's frame of mind: it is one of eager hopeful endeavour. It is our *ambition*, he says, to please Him, and he tells us precisely what his objects of ambition are. It is not every one who can afford to be so frank. These objects are *two*: to please Christ, and to preach the gospel where it has not been preached before.

It is true that no stress can be laid on the strict rendering 'we are ambitious.' In the first place it is *not* a strict rendering. Our word 'ambition' keeps something of the base associations of its Latin original and is a poor representative of the nobler Greek. But further, the Greek word itself has lost its special colouring and has come to mean *any* eager striving, not a striving for *distinction*. It is the most eager form of pursuit known to higher minds, and is therefore employed for the aims of St. Paul.

Yet there is more to be said than this. The histories of the word and of the man who uses it are parallel. They illustrate each other. Human affections are capable of being diverted like the words which express them, and retain their vividness when they have changed their aim.

Ambition is *checked* by a religious career deliberately adopted as a calling. One sees plainly enough that, theoretically at least, there is no room for it there. But the eagerness of aim in life remains. It is diverted. What becomes of it? Does it merely change colour into an ecclesiastical or religious ambition? Is it working unacknowledged, and asserting itself more and more in the inward struggle of motives? Or does this eagerness of aim take a fresh course altogether and become an eager striving to please our Master? That was St. Paul's history. His passion ran into the current expression in the text: '*My* aim is to please him.' His ambition left the privileges of pure Jewish blood, the glories of the nation, the perfect fulfilment of the law on which it had rested. It did not venture to dwell on sufferings and achievements. It paused on his children in the gospel, and their salvation by his means, but it rested nowhere finally except in the Cross of the Lord Jesus Christ.

We dwell on St. Paul not merely because the words of the text are his words, but because we cannot do without him in this matter. It is because ambition did, as a fact, undergo this transformation in him that we can speak of it as possible for ourselves. What St. Paul did for Christian doctrine by his thought is evident enough both to friends and foes. It is perhaps not so evident what he did for Christian life by *his* life, and yet this was the greatest side of his work.

It must be confessed that in us ambition does not undergo this transformation easily and readily. It remains in the man with a religious career as religious ambition. And there is another strange phase of it. Contrary to the whole tenor of our Lord's teaching, it has been thought spiritually-minded to cherish ambition as to honours and distinctions in the life to come. Fortunately we hear little of such motives now. We need not wonder that ambition should prove so obstinate a factor in human character when we consider how earnestly it is stimulated at all places of education, and not least at our Universities. Can we expect a man to go out into civil life and to make it his first object to serve God in his generation, or to serve his country or his clients or his dependents, if up to that moment we have pressed on him by every means in our power that the first thing for him to do was to obtain distinction for himself, with the bye-consideration that the distinction would reflect some of its lustre on the body to which he belonged? Can we not see here some explanation of the evident prevalence of *personal* aims in the public men of our day?

---

[1] R. Moffat Gautrey, *The Glory of Going On*, 146.

Is there anything better, any substitute? There is only one thing better, and that is so difficult, so distant. It is that we make it our aim to please Him.

2. What is the one great difficulty of this transmuted ambition? It is that, as the text says, 'we are absent from the Lord.' 'Whether present or absent,' St. Paul says. It made no difference to him. But it does make a great difference to us. To please a present Master is a motive which all would allow as sufficient. Ambition as a motive for public service would disappear under His eye. And much more would this be the case in His immediate service, the service of His Church. We should be able to do what we wish to do now—to do everything for Him. So we imagine. But now the drawback is so obvious. There is no sign of how He takes what we do.

But this is not quite an accurate account of the matter. We do find indirect assurances of our acceptance in the opinion of men, and in our own consciousness. First, suppose we meet with gratitude and confidence from those we deal with. Here is an assurance that we are pleasing Him. Yet there is danger in looking for it too anxiously, as we soon begin to seek it directly for its *own sake*, and, when that is done, it ceases to be a message. In that case, not only do we lose the higher motive and the close relation with the Lord which it implies, but a wholly different process at once sets in, in the moulding of our character. A life to please the Lord moulds us slowly and surely on His pattern. A life to please men, even good men, moulds us on an inferior pattern.

Secondly, we find an assurance that we are pleasing Him in our own consciousness. It reports an access of peace and hope, a sense of spiritual sunshine. This, we believe, is imparted by Him. Yet we know too well the precariousness of such intuitions. If this joy, in the sense of pleasing Him, is directly imparted, what are we to say of spiritual distress and depression? Are they signs that we have not been pleasing Him, or is it often truer to say of these, 'It is mine own infirmity'? Spiritual depression often does not mean anything more than physical weakness, or at most a temporary weakness of faith. If we urge as a topic of consolation that depression may be purely subjective, is it not honest to own that exultation may be so as well? Thus it may be pleaded that the sense of acceptance may arise from an opposite kind of infirmity. But it can never be an infirmity for a soul which desires God to believe and to rejoice in His love. This is the health of the soul.

Is this, then, to be our object in life, to please Him, and to have nothing to look to here but these phantom assurances, as the sceptic will certainly consider them to be? See, he says, what abundant objects life presents. Can we substitute for them, in their nearness, colour, and potency, something so distant and unrecognizable? Now, doubt does not always hold this language about the abundance of sufficient aims in life, but it is true that they lie round the young in sufficient profusion. Can we keep them in the front and relegate the aim of *pleasing Him* to a nominal headship in the background? No, it must be in the front. We must see all other aims through it, and then we shall see them in their true colour and proportion.

Such a life is a heroic life if not a quixotic one. We want a life which will suit the average mass of mankind who are not heroes. It is true that Christianity is essentially a heroism, but that is just why it is adapted to the mass of mankind. There are in every man possibilities of heroism. They may only show themselves in the passive form of admiring the heroism of others, but they can be called out, and this is what Christianity does.

But, is it *possible* to please God? Had we not better restrict ourselves to the more guarded phrase, 'Keep his commandments,' and abandon the spontaneity, freedom, and interest of so incautious an expression as pleasing God?

And first, is it possible from the human side? Consider the sight of a good man steadily fixing his desire on serving his Master, sacrificing present good to it, striving with himself, beaten and returning to the endeavour, and all this by faith, without any sensible mark to encourage him. How must this appear in the sight of Him for whom it is done, by whose grace it is done? Do the faults and failures neutralize the moral beauty of the effort, or do they only make it more pathetic? It is perhaps dangerous to guess how things appear in God's sight, but something like this seems implied in the conception of Him as our Father. From the human side it is possible to please God.

But is it possible from the Divine side? Can God be pleased? The Psalmist says, 'The Lord's delight is in them that fear him, in them that wait for his mercy.' And the word which describes the Lord's pleasure in His people runs through the whole range of the Old Testament. Are we to dismiss this expression along with others as anthropopathic? We must remember that it is God in Christ that we are concerned with. God manifest in the flesh. The anthropopathic expressions of the Old Testament (not of course all of them, but such as that we are dealing with) are literally true of Him. He is pleased with me and my efforts to honour and serve Him, just as I am pleased and touched by the loving acts of those who are close and dear to me. Nothing is too small to escape Him if it be done in love and simplicity. He can be pleased. It is a *childish* view of religion, but of such children is the Kingdom of God.[1]

FIFTH SUNDAY AFTER EPIPHANY.

The Divine Worker.

'My Father worketh hitherto, and I work.'—Jn 5^{17}.

Of all scientists, God is the first and greatest. If God made—or is making—the universe, He knows much more about it and is far more interested in it than all the scientists together. Wireless and the constitution of the atom and 'cosmic rays' are no surprise to Him. What might surprise Him is to find a certain type of sincerely religious people regarding science as a sort of pagan propaganda. God is only waiting for us to find things out as our capacity grows to utilize them. Science is only finding things out—'thinking God's thoughts after Him.' To talk of science and religion as being in conflict with each other is tantamount to affirming that God is divided against Himself. 'All's love and all's Law,' as Browning has taught us. Evolution and Bethlehem have the same origin. So many people have the idea that God only talks theology, but the words of Jesus are, 'My Father *worketh* up to this hour.' For thousands of years the older thinkers, misled by a static rather than a dynamic conception of God, had thought His work complete. To-day, that conception is being replaced by a greater and a truer. 'My Father worketh . . .' Or in the words of the most recent science: 'This is a growing and evolving world, and not a static or decaying one.'

We do not mean that Jesus anticipated evolution. In Christ the Eternal took flesh as a contemporary man. If He had not been subject to the limitations of humanity, He would not have been man: and if He was not *man* we are of all men most pitiable. He did not know everything that God was doing—He said so; which mattered nothing. But He knew that God was doing everything, which mattered supremely. And He knew—not by our tortuous proofs, but by the immediacy and the intuitive certainty of His oneness with the Father, the *principle* of God's all-comprehensive relation to this world. 'My Father worketh up to this hour.' This conception of God, really established, reinforces faith for us, and places religion on a new and unassailable basis. As Canon Streeter points out in *Reality*: 'Primitive religion looks for the evidence of Divine action merely in the abnormal and the inexplicable: in the comet and the thunderbolt rather than in the sunrise and the growing blade—*with the result* that the narrow margin left for the recognition of any specifically Divine activity at all, shrinks day by day with every advance of human knowledge. No small part of human progress has consisted in getting away from the conception of the Divine as essentially the irrational. Science is the great cleanser of human thinking: *it makes impossible any religion but the highest.*'

If science is to have a religion at all, it must be a religion in which God is working—not one in which God delegated His powers to a fallible human institution, or His final revelation to a book, however sacred. Science has long looked out into the black, unfathomable abyss and seen giant nebulæ, which may be worlds in the making: but to-day it is looking upon *this* world as in the making still. This new conception of the world compels a new conception of God, and yet one as old as Jesus—God dynamic—according to Jesus the only true conception of God.

But what we want to say here particularly is, that there is no clearer and more self-evidencing illustration of the vital principle of God's continuing working—and, if you will, of the co-working of God and Christ—than what we call the Incarnation itself. We are coming to see that Christ is not a Divine interposition in the world, so much as the inevitable climax and keystone of the whole Divine process, in the world from the beginning. And if it be objected that it is contrary to the evolutionary process that 'the climax should come in the middle,' the answer is simple. Christ *is* the end of the Divine revelation to the world: but we are, as yet, only at the *beginning* of Christ *for* the world. He is 'the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world.' One wonders if the Seer of Patmos realized what a tremendous thing—what a vital cosmic as well as theological thing—he had said when he wrote that. 'God was in Christ reconciling the world to himself.' Christ was God working on His largest human scale. Whatever humanity's relation to sin might have been, Christ would have come to the world as the 'Light of the world,' the focus of the Divine interpretation of the world. 'My Father worketh hitherto, and I work.' Christ here ranges Himself not merely with a Divine redemptive process, but with the whole historical Divine self-revelatory process. For He elects here to define Himself in terms of the ceaseless Divine working for the world rather than in any lesser or secondary terms.

---

[1] E. R. Bernard, *Sermons and Lectures*, 14.

'My Father worketh up to this hour, and I work too.' The Incarnation has its fullest interpretation as the climax of the Divine 'work.' It is not the Cross, then, that explains the Incarnation: it is the Incarnation that explains the Cross. And the traditional confusion and the many conflicting explanations of the Atonement are largely due to the fatal mistake of endeavouring to separate between the functions of the death and the life of Jesus. We are saved not by the death of Christ, but by Christ, by the unity of His life and death. The Incarnation is the at-one-ment, as Westcott says. And the very foundation-stone of our faith is that He that hath seen Him hath seen the Father, in the fullest sense and the only sense in which it is possible for man to have vision of God.

> I say, the acknowledgment of God in Christ
> Accepted by thy reason, solves for thee
> All questions in the earth and out of it.

If all this is true—if God is still working—nothing is finished.

The World is not finished. 'The Kingdom of this world is become the Kingdom of our God,' but it is not finished. How is it to be finished? Is it to be by some celestial catastrophe: by some interpretation of Adventism which becomes more and more unnecessary and inconceivable as you realize more clearly and fully the truth and implications of these sublime words of Christ's—'My Father worketh up to this hour, and I work'? 'I am here not only as the fulfilment of God's ceaseless cosmic purpose, the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world, the historic symbol of the eternal redemptive principle of sacrifice in the Divine heart; but I am here also as the historic embodiment of the Divine *method*.'

My Father works: He effects His eternal purpose as a worker in the world, not as a prestidigitator in the clouds. 'And I work.' Divine work is going to save this world, work in the spirit and reinforced by the power of the indefatigable, undefeatable, unresting Divine Worker. To give up hope for the world, then, is to be radically false to Christ's most definite revelation of the part God is playing in the world, and the way in which He is carrying it out.

Theology is not finished. God is still working in the human mind. The discoveries of science are not the creations of science: they are merely thinking God's thoughts a long way after Him. It is surely the height of foolishness and unfaith to imagine that God reveals Himself to theologians, but not to scientists. All truth is one. If evolution is true it is as much true for faith as for biology. If the world is a thousand million years old, instead of being created 4004 B.C., this is as true for religion as for science. What basis is there in reason or faith for accepting the fundamental heresy that the only new truths God has to reveal to-day are always about the universe and never about the soul? 'We are always hearing of the failure of Christianity,' says Canon Streeter. 'That failure, I would urge, is in the main due to the fact that the churches have never dared openly to break with the idols of the past, and publicly to discard certain ideas of God and of His ways with man which are no longer the highest we can conceive.' That is true, but why should it be? Why should men hesitate to allow God to lead them to new heights of the vision of the Spirit—if to a new earth literally, why not to a new heaven? If 'My Father worketh up to now,' then religion is not static but dynamic: not a creed, but an ever-expanding Life.

Finally, *Man is not finished.* There are many arguments for immortality. But none more cogent than the argument of man himself. In two senses. First, the argument of what man already is; and second, the argument of what he is *not*—the fact that man is not yet finished, which is our point here. To believe that Nature is content to give man capacities that he never fulfils, and is satisfied to leave him for ever half-finished, is to ask us to believe that that which has produced intelligence is itself unintelligent. And if for Nature you substitute 'God'—the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, who 'worketh up to now'—the unfinishedness of man becomes an argument of constraining force for the inevitableness of a larger life.

Quoting a remark of H. G. Wells—'Whether we live for ever or die to-morrow does not affect righteousness,' Canon Streeter very acutely points out that though there is a note of idealism in it, it is not true. 'For if God's righteousness may lightly scrap the individual, human righteousness may do the same.' It is not reasonable to expect a man to think more of the worth of his soul than God does.

If God sets so little value on personality as to cast it 'as rubbish to the void' at death, then the value we set on it is a complete illusion. And with the intrinsic worth of personality go all moral values. If the next world crumbles, all that is best in this world crumbles too. If Mr. Wells feels that it doesn't make any difference whether he goes on or not, it doesn't matter very much perhaps: but if God feels like that it matters—awfully. But He doesn't. My Father worketh up to now. Then He is at work on us, *and we are not finished.* 'My Father worketh.' Why? Because God is love. And love has never finished.[1]

Septuagesima.

An Apology for Cain.

'Not as Cain, who was of that wicked one, and slew his brother. And wherefore slew he him? Because his own works were evil, and his brother's righteous.'—1 Jn 3[12].

Was Cain 'the corrupt father of all vice and murder'? Had he a vicious soul? Was he 'criminally-minded'? In a word, was he a *bad man*?

His sin has made Cain the horror of all generations, as the prototype of crime itself. We are not dealing with Cain's sin, however, but with Cain the man. Of the crime itself, there is no need to speak. What can one add more damning than that haunting verse of Scripture, 'The voice of thy brother's blood crieth unto me from the ground'?

Following the records of Genesis, let us see if there are any suggestions given in the story which may make Cain's deed more understandable, less of the senseless, unprovoked piece of brutality it seems, and the man himself less of a blind enigma of iniquity.

The first point usually stressed in a modern court of justice is the question of *motive* or *cause*. Fortunately for our guidance, the motive behind this deed of passion is fully known. The two brothers, Cain the elder and Abel the younger, brought offerings for Jehovah's altar from their own appropriate line of work. Cain, being a tiller of the ground, brought the fruits of the field; Abel, being a keeper of sheep, brought the firstlings of his flock. This difference in the substance or nature of the gifts counts for nothing. In the minds of later Jews it did count, from theological reasons, because of the presence of spilled blood in Abel's offering. But ideally, the offering of both men was perfect. Each gave of his best, the natural produce of his labour, which is always a man's finest gift to God or any one else. The Epistle to the Hebrews, in its great argument for faith, quotes our case as follows: 'By faith Abel offered a more acceptable sacrifice than Cain.' That sentence, it should be noted, reckons each offering as *sacrifice*, but considers one more acceptable than the other, the reason being *faith*, or the heart of the offerer. We may admit, therefore, that the inward state of Abel's mind was more perfect (shall we say, more religious?) than Cain's.

But what concerns us at the moment is the simple fact of the rejection. We should observe what that rejection seemed to imply. According to Semitic ideas, it meant that God had passed Cain by in favour of the younger brother. He was here dispossessed of his 'spiritual birthright,' a leadership that carried with it certain definite privileges, political, judicial, and religious. He was not dispossessed by man (the Hebrews would not have considered that possible), but by an inscrutable Divine election. If this is so (it is the common Hebrew explanation of Cain's rejection), then we can understand the cause of his anger and passion. We often scourge Esau in our thoughts for so lightly regarding this same birthright, and being willing, seriously or in jest, to part with it for a mess of red pottage and to stay a casual hunger. That is a charge at least that no one can level against Cain. He prized it too much.

Not for one moment does this consideration of Cain's motive lessen the crime and horror of murder. It does allow us, however, to estimate what Semitic thought considered to be the 'provocation' that soured his heart.

Passing from the motive of this grim story, are we given any indications of this man's nature and qualities which may lead us to understand him better?

In the first place, he is constantly portrayed to us as a man of amazing vitality and energy, one even with a touch of genius and directive originality, the type of person, indeed, who with great inherent powers may either touch heaven or sink to hell. The record puts this fact in a dramatic phrase when it asserts that 'sin was crouching at his door.' This is a word-parable that at once suggests temptation, like a wolf sitting on its haunches, watching its victim for a chance, unwary moment. Quite obviously, this is a picture describing a man of vigorous passions and temptations, who must guard himself carefully, for by the very health and surge of his own nature sin is crouching at his door.

---

[1] H. E. Brierley, *Life Indeed*, 17.

It is easy for some people to control desire and walk straight. In their case, virtue is often a question of a placid temperament and a colourless nature. It is their gain that they are untempted and untorn as more vigorous people are. There are many of us so bloodless and so lustreless that we have not even the longing to break bounds! Our good is to be judged not only by what we do or refrain from doing, but often by the unguessed forces that are resisted.

From the records themselves we may adduce proofs of Cain's amazing vitality and originality. First of all, we are told that he was a tiller of the ground, and Abel a keeper of sheep. It is a remarkable fact in history that the evolution and refinement of civilization have come from the tillers of the soil. The pastoral peoples of the world have made little progress. They live to-day much as they lived in Abraham's time, *static*: for the conditions of their life are unchangingly meagre and simple. Cain was a tiller of the soil, because, like all agriculturists, he had the energy and vision to foresee and plan results. He found an outlet for that energy in constructive work.

Further (how beautifully impartial the Bible is), we read that this despised murderer was the first man to 'build a city.' No doubt, this meant little more than a few rough huts, with a wattle hedge around them to scare off intruders and prowling beasts. But in simple expedients like these lie the origins of all social growth and government. Here by Cain's genius, according to the Genesis story, lies the origin of communal life, and all future social institutions. The natural inference is obvious—that both his good and his evil, in their outgoings, sprang from his aggressive personality of boundless energy and restless genius!

Further, the records (once more startlingly impartial) assert that this fund of power passed as a direct and cleansed inheritance to his descendants. Cain's line of heredity is definitely represented as leading to a string of people of genius and fertile invention! *Jabal*, one of his descendants, is said to be the 'father of such as dwell in tents,' people who could trek with their cattle and engage in commerce, the barterers of the world, who might migrate and find new lands. In such humble origins we can see the germ of commercial progress. *Jubal*, another descendant, is claimed to be the inventor of the harp and the pipe, a man of music and the arts, in whom we see the dawn of artistic things. *Tubal-Cain*, still another of this noted line, is reputed to be the first artificer in brass and iron, a craftsman of skill, in whom the latent seed of Cain's genius once more blossomed in new productive ways.

There is yet one thing to state in his favour. Some years after his crime, when his first child was born, he named him Enoch. That name, as Dr. Driver points out, denotes 'dedication,' 'a new start,' 'a fresh beginning.' What a lovely and suggestive name for the child of a sinner like this! It is usual to deny Cain any true and effective repentance—on the principle, I suppose, that if we give a dog a bad name, we may as well drown him. But is there not more than a suggestion in the name of his child that Cain came to himself in deeper ways than we imagine? May we not see in this name a dim recognition of God's wonderful mercy in shielding him from the consequences of his sin and giving him a new land and a new start? In time, he might find the best proof of that mercy even in his shameful brand. He might come to realize, as many of us do with our own scars, that God's brand may prove His deepest mercy.

These are the conclusions, then, from this ancient tale of tragedy.

In the first place, the greatest curse in human life is not wickedness, but power untamed. In the Middle Ages, the young aspirant for knighthood laid his sharp sword on God's altar, while he prayed steadfastly all the night. That sword represented power to curse or bless. What the world needs is power, power even like Cain's, but *power consecrated*! We need the sword on the altar.

Further, Cain's story reveals how easily sin may gain dominion over an uncontrolled heart. It 'croucheth at the door.' Sin crawls like a panther, ready for its pounce. As we think of that sleek thing pawing at the door, we know that our safety lies in a 'great mastery.' And thank God, if the panther prowls at the door, there is Someone Else there, unafraid of any beast, who knocks, and if He enters, brings perfect mastery to disordered souls.

Once more, the commonest cause of sin is not 'the mind of vice,' or the 'criminal heart,' but a passionate temper. How we laugh at temper! 'It is nothing, and will pass.' Preachers and moralists make too much of trifles like temper! Would God they were trifles! As it is, every deed of vengeance and crime, every wrong that has scarred life, and every ugly thing that has wounded man has come from such little things as temper, jealousy, and envy, *when fanned in a high wind*![1]

[1] J. Black, *An Apology for Rogues*, 17.

Elisha—The Successor of Elijah (2 Kings ii. 1-18).

By Professor Hermann Gunkel, University of Halle.

The narrative opens with an introductory clause which anticipates one of the main incidents that are to be related. The events in question took place 'when the Lord took Elijah by a whirlwind up into heaven.' This clause cannot be meant to indicate the climax of the narrative, for no skilful story-teller would thus reveal his secret at the very start, and that too in a subordinate clause! And therefore it is misleading to entitle the incident related in these verses 'the translation of Elijah.' The real culminating point of the story has to be gathered from what follows.

One of the main tasks of future scholarship will be to bring together parallels to stories such as this both from the Old Testament itself and from the literature of other peoples. That the collecting of such parallels has been suspended during recent years is greatly to be regretted. When we ask whether there are similar stories of 'translations' outside of Israel, we find that they are quite numerous. Apart from the translation of the Biblical Enoch, there is that of Xisuthros, the hero of the Babylonian deluge, of the Greek Herakles, and of the Roman Romulus; and of Moses it is said, with a diminution of the mythological element, that Jahveh Himself buried him and no man knows his grave. Of course it was only of very outstanding men that such stories were told; and the transference of such a conception to Elijah is an unconscious tribute to that great man. After he had gone hence, the conviction prevailed among his people that he had been far too great a man to leave this life in the ordinary way and go down to Sheol like other men. That he was taken up 'by a whirlwind' shows the prevailing conceptions regarding the deity who thus took him. God moves in a whirlwind over the land. When the wind roars and shakes the trees, ancient Israel realizes that God is near. And it was to take a place in this 'warlike host' that accompanied Jahveh through the air, that Elijah was taken away from this world. All his life he had been a messenger of storm, a fiery champion of his God.

And now to the narrative itself. From Gilgal, north of Bethel, which the narrator regards as having been his home at the time, Elijah sets forth on his last journey. He is accompanied by Elisha, his servant and pupil. Ancient Israel looked upon it as a matter of course that a 'man of God' should have such a disciple to render him personal service, or, in the Hebrew phrase, 'to pour water upon his hands'—one who would do his errands, enjoy his intimate fellowship, and ultimately take his place. Moses had Joshua, and afterwards Elisha himself had Gehazi. In times still more primitive the magician had his pupil, and in after days the university professor had his famulus, as a Faust had his Wagner. 'And Elijah said unto Elisha, Tarry here, I pray thee, for Jahveh hath sent me (only) as far as Bethel. And Elisha said, As the Lord liveth, and as thy soul liveth, I will not leave thee. So they went down to Bethel. And the sons of the prophets that were at Bethel came forth to Elisha, and said unto him, Knowest thou that the Lord will take away thy master from thy head to-day? And he said, I also know it: hold ye your peace.' How easily we read these words! How little they seem to contain! And modern scientific commentators contribute little to their exposition, apparently unaware of their profound and wide significance. We have still to learn that the Hebrew style of narrative is not so simple as it seems to a superficial glance. All primitive story-telling—including that of Israel—fixes the reader's attention mainly on what is perceptible to the senses, on what can be seen and heard. In that ancient civilization the inner life was not yet sufficiently disclosed to be expressly treated and described in detail. On the other hand, that inner life was there and—in Israel how richly—developed. But it finds only indirect expression: it is hidden behind actions and words. Therefore the expositor's real task is to read between the lines and bring out the spiritual conditions and experiences thus shown through word and deed. In the present case Elijah, Elisha, and the sons of the prophets are all revealed in and through what they say. Elijah is unwilling to have his disciple with him. The reason is not given, but we are meant to guess it. It is not fitting that the ordinary man should be a witness of the Divine secret that is about to be revealed. Besides, Elijah is anxious to spare his young friend. Jahveh is terrible, and how easily can His nearness prove destructive to one who rashly and unbidden intrudes on His revelation. At this stage Elijah cannot give Elisha the real reason for his request to be left alone: the slightest hint of it would reveal the secret prematurely. A pretext must suffice meantime, and so he says, 'Jahveh has sent me (only) as far as Bethel.' The explanation has an air of probability. God sends His prophet on errands, both near and far, and for such a short distance, '(only) as far as Bethel,' he needs no escort. The explanation is, of course, true as far as it goes; but it is not the whole truth. The high ideal of absolute and complete veracity had not yet dawned on the hearts of these men. Elisha declares that he will not leave his master. His forcible manner of speech indicates that he is labouring under great excitement. He too is a prophet, and has more than human knowledge. He too knows what is imminent, but he declares earnestly that after having accompanied his master for many a long year on all his errands, he will not now abandon him in his last hour on earth, but will go with him into the dread meeting with the Divine. Elijah's answer is not recorded by the narrator, who avoids every superfluous word. One of the most difficult tasks of the expositor is to supply what is lacking in the ancient record. Here we are to gather that he silently nods his reluctant permission.

In order to exhibit the heroism of Elisha's resolve to abide by his master, the narrator now introduces other persons as a foil. These are the sons of the prophets, members of the prophetic guilds who, as is implied, were at that time to be found in every city in Israel, and who in communal life cultivated the spirit of ecstasy. It is also implied here that the great prophet was the acknowledged head of these guilds. A somewhat different picture is presented by the accounts that deal expressly with Elijah himself. These show Elijah as appearing everywhere by himself, whereas Elisha certainly seems to have been closely associated with these sons of the prophets. They too are credited with supernatural knowledge. They have somehow come to know that their master was to be in their city that day, and, in accordance with Eastern custom, they have come forth to give him a respectful reception. They have also learned of Elijah's imminent departure. Some ominous rumour, some dread whisper has preceded the two wayfarers, and has passed from lip to lip, and the sons of the prophets are filled with amazement when they realize that Elisha is determined to follow his master even on *this* journey. 'Knowest thou not that Jahveh will take thy master from thy head to-day?' they ask in awe. Elisha replies, 'I know it: hold ye your peace.' Inferior minds are glib of speech; greater minds do not attempt to utter the ineffable. The whole scene is bathed in the dread mystery of the future and constitutes a genuine prophetic scene. The narrator has himself felt the grandeur of the whole situation and, to help his readers to appreciate it to the full, has repeated it three times. Later narrative art gives prominence to significant points by particularizing them; ancient art achieves the same purpose by repetition. Similar repetitions of entire incidents frequently occur in folklorist narratives. Thus, when Bethel is reached, Elijah again orders his disciple to leave him, and again Elisha declares his determination to remain. Again, this time from Jericho, sons of the prophets greet the two, and again Elisha bids them be silent. In Jericho the scene at Bethel is repeated. This time Elijah says, 'Jahveh has sent me (only) as far as the Jordan.' Even this is not yet the whole truth—but once more Elisha demonstrates his loyalty. Thrice has the temptation been presented and thrice he has conquered.

They now went forward to the Jordan—not a long way from Jericho. Fifty sons of the prophets belonging to Jericho—there must thus have been a large prophetic settlement in that city—went with them part of the way, but stopped some distance from the river. Evidently these men also would have liked to be near Elijah in that fateful hour, but they had not the courage that endures to the end.

Here the skilful narrator has again set forth Elisha's perfect loyalty against the background of lesser men. That he uses the same persons for this purpose only shows his wise restraint, and, as we shall see immediately, he has reserved these fifty men for another purpose. These incidents display the fine qualities of Hebrew narrative art: the details are worked out in view of the whole situation, and it is borne in upon us that these writers had attained a very high degree of skill.

At the Jordan Elijah performs a notable miracle. He strikes the water with his cloak; the water is divided, and the two men pass over the river dryshod. This is a frequent motif in folklore of all ages. A similar marvel is done by Moses at the Red Sea, and again—in imitation of that—by Joshua at the Jordan. It is repeated here by Elijah, because it was felt that no higher honour could be paid to that great man than to ascribe to him such marvels as were credited to the mighty men of Israel's early days. But Elijah works this miracle with his cloak. This was an animal skin, the only garment that the prophet wore. Prophets of his type—this is confirmed from other sources—had nothing in common with the new fashions of that day in respect of 'soft clothing.' They retained the customs of the olden time, when Israel dwelt in the desert, and even in his dress Elijah clung to the old ways.

Miracle workers always had some instrument with which they performed their marvels. Moses had his rod. Elijah here uses the mantle which he had once thrown over Elisha, thus constraining that young man to follow him. The underlying conception was that the garment had become charged with Divine power by its constant contact with the person of the man of God. The same idea shines through the gospel story of 'the woman with the issue of blood' (Mk $5^{25ff.}$). At this stage of the narrative the full meaning of the miracle is not apparent, but, as we shall see, the narrator is here also pursuing a well-considered purpose.

Elisha has thus accompanied the prophet to the last stage, and his fidelity now receives its reward. Deeply touched by such loyalty, Elijah offers to fulfil a wish of his disciple. 'Ask what I shall do for thee, before I be taken from thee.' Now at last Elijah himself speaks plainly of what is to happen—further concealment would be meaningless. As a reward for his fidelity he offers at this final moment to 'do something for him,' *i.e.* he will bequeath him a miracle. This means that the great prophet possesses Divine power and can do much for others. The same conception recurs frequently in the stories about Elisha himself. But as Elijah cannot know Elisha's special desire, he invites him to express a wish—another motif familiar to students of folklore. What will Elisha now wish for? How will he utilize this unique opportunity? Will he ask for a son, or for some material possession? Nay! His heart's desire transcends that. He asks for no specific marvel, however great; he desires the Divine power itself. Not all of it—that would be too much—but two-thirds of it. 'I pray thee, let two-thirds of thy spirit be upon me.' In ancient Israel the 'spirit' was not conceived as an indivisible personal being, but rather as a Divine power that could work marvels. Such a 'spirit' could be divided into various 'spirits,' and Elijah had his own, 'the spirit of Elijah.' But two-thirds was the portion of the first-born in the inheritance of his father (Dt 21^{17}). Even that was a great demand, and Elijah answers, 'Thou hast asked a great deal.' The implication is that Elisha is a venturesome man and ambitious in his desires. But it is not in any man's power, not even in Elijah's, to grant such a wish. God alone can impart the spirit and He pours it out as seemeth to Him good—another thought that goes deep. But Elijah can give his disciple a 'sign,' and ancient Israel, in its naïve objective way of thinking, attached great importance to such 'signs,' as manifestations of what was spiritual. 'If thou see me when I am taken from thee, it shall be so unto thee; but if not, it shall not be so.' Only he who has received the spirit can see into the Divine: to the ordinary eye, that world remains closed.

And now the narrator has reached the 'translation' itself. By skilful preparation he has placed it, as it were, on a lofty pedestal. The two men go forward talking, when suddenly a Divine phenomenon occurs. Thus suddenly and arrestingly the Divine always manifests itself in the world. Even when the fact of its coming is known, men can never calculate the moment of its coming. This phenomenon was 'a chariot of fire, and horses of fire.' We hear of similar phenomena in other passages of the Old Testament, and the reference is always to chariots of war. Jahveh is a warrior God who fights his battles in the air with fiery hosts. These figures probably represent a combination of conceptions—fiery spirits like those mentioned in *Thousand and One Nights*, mythological conceptions of the darting thunderbolts or volcanic flames, as well as of the constellations which ride in chariots across the sky fighting Jahveh's battles. The important idea for us here is that it is to this host that Elijah is now translated. That belligerent prophet, who fought so heroically for his deity on earth, is now called, when his earthly warfare is over, to fight God's battles from the sky. In spite of the mythological dress in which it is clothed, it is a wonderful tribute to the man. Just as some modern nations still love to 'deify' their favourite heroes, so Israel translated their Elijah to a place among the fighting spirits. When this heavenly portent appeared, it 'parted the two men asunder,' *i.e.* Elisha, overwhelmed by the storm, was hurled to one side, 'and Elijah went up by a whirlwind into heaven'—a sample of the simple but profoundly impressive words of which the Old Testament is so full. That this scene is located in the district on the other side of the river Jordan is readily understood as another indication that Israel ranked him with Moses. He too had disappeared from men's sight in the land that lay 'beyond Jordan.'

'*And Elisha saw it.*' No cloud obscured the manifestation of the Divine! No frenzy of fear had blinded his sight! He was counted worthy to see the Divine with open eyes. And so Elijah's sign to him was fulfilled; he received a portion of the prophet's spirit. But his first emotion was not that of joyous pride, nor that of human awe in presence of the Divine power; he was filled with indescribable pain at the loss of his master. 'My father, my father, the chariots of Israel and the horsemen thereof!' For Elisha it meant the loss of a father, for Israel the loss of its great wall of defence. This conception of Elijah as the champion of Israel is not in keeping with the rest of the tradition regarding him. Elijah did not come prominently forward to help Israel in its battles. All his life he was in opposition to his nation. It was otherwise with Elisha. In the struggles with Syria, and especially under the dynasty of Jehu, he was a tower of strength to the nation, and to *him* was justly given the title, 'the chariots of Israel and the horsemen thereof!' (2 K 13^{14}). Later days, therefore, have painted the picture of Elijah with colours borrowed from Elisha's career.

'Then,' when Elisha looked up again, 'he saw Elijah no more.' The Divine world was opened but for a moment and straightway the door was closed again. This is another touch of that chaste and truly religious restraint in presence of the mystery of the Divine.

Then Elisha 'took hold of his own clothes and rent them in two pieces.' This rending of the loosely woven garments was in Israel the immediate consequence of extreme excitation, especially of fear and pain. There he now stood naked. But 'he took up the mantle of Elijah that fell from him'—no earthly thing can enter into heaven. This is a beautiful combination of two different motifs. The successor falls heir to the robe of his predecessor—an accepted custom in antiquity. But this garment was a wonder-working mantle. How many marvels had the great prophet wrought by its means! And, with a truly graphic touch, it is now shown that Elisha has actually inherited his master's 'spirit.' He proceeds at once to put this to the proof. He advances to the river and exclaims from the depths of his soul, 'Where is Jahveh? the God of Elijah, where is he?'[1] *i.e.* Jahveh, who did marvels by Elijah, turn now to me. With these words he smites the waters exactly as his master had done. It is a moment of breathless suspense, the culmination of the whole story. The miracle is repeated. 'The waters were divided hither and thither. And Elisha went over.' Elijah's power *has* passed to him. This part of the narrative is a clear proof that a marvel could be transferred by tradition from one man of God to another. Elisha has done what his master did—he takes rank on the same heights as he. We can also see now *why* this act was narrated of Elijah at the first crossing of the river. It was done, in order to be able to show, at the close, that Elijah's successor was able to accomplish the same marvel.

The narrator now returns to the fifty sons of the prophets belonging to Jericho, and we can now see why they have been brought into the story. They see Elisha's marvel from afar, as they had done the other, and they exclaim, 'The spirit of Elijah doth rest on Elisha.' In these words they reveal the main purpose of the whole narrative. Ancient story-tellers themselves offer no comment on their own narratives; they prefer the comment to come from the lips of one or other of their *dramatis personæ*. Then these sons of the prophets come to meet Elisha, and 'bow themselves to the ground before him,' as before their new master. Elijah has passed away, but Elisha is his accredited successor, the head of the prophetic order.

This is the end of the story as planned by the narrator. It would completely destroy its symmetry to add to it the incidents that immediately follow it in the Book of Kings.

There is, however, a supplement which has been added by a later hand. The sons of the prophets say to Elisha, 'There be with (or among) thy servants fifty strong men; let them go and seek thy master. Perhaps the spirit of Jahveh hath taken him and cast him upon some mountain or into some ravine.' This addendum is interesting as affording us a glance into the nature of prophetic ecstasy. When the spirit comes upon a prophet, he is sometimes rapt away and courses in wild flight over hill and dale. He may even occasionally be hurt. The sons of the prophets therefore suggest that Elijah may be lying somewhere on the hills, exhausted or even dead. Elisha knows better, and says, 'Do not send,' but when they continue to urge their request, he reluctantly consents. The men go forth and search for three days, but they do not find the vanished prophet. When they return, Elisha says, 'Did I not tell you not to go?' He knew that Elijah would no longer be found on earth.

That this is a later addition to the narrative with which we have been occupied is clear from the fact that in the original story the sons of the prophets knew from the beginning that Elijah was to be taken away. In this supplement they are unaware of it. There is another slight discrepancy. In the main story there are fifty of these sons of the prophets. In the supplement we read of fifty strong ones amongst them. That is to say, the writer of this supplement had not thoroughly read and remembered the original. The purpose of the addendum was to furnish proof that Elijah had not merely died, but that he had actually been 'taken away.' Such supplements to ancient tradition were attempts, on the part of men who found it difficult to believe the narratives, to persuade themselves and others that the events recorded were really true. Judged from the artistic standpoint, the addition is open to the criticism that it again diverts the attention of the reader from Elisha, who is the chief figure, to Elijah, about whom everything needful has already been told.

---

[1] V.^{14} as far as 'and smote the waters' is an unimportant addition. Cf. R.V.

The purpose of the original story was to show how Elisha became Elijah's successor. The hero of it is Elisha, not Elijah. The author compares him with the greater man and shows that he was worthy to be ranked side by side with him. That was the considered verdict of men who had a far more vivid impression of the two than any of us can have to-day, and is therefore of great value to us for our own conception of the history of the time. In order to set forth his conception of Elisha, the narrator has utilized an older tradition of Elijah's ascension. Of course in that narrative Elijah was the centre of interest, but our author has ventured so to adapt the story that his own hero, Elisha, plays the chief part. He has succeeded beyond measure and has given us one of the most perfect narratives that we possess. Without detracting from the greatness of Elijah he has made Elisha the central figure of his narrative. It made a splendid opening to his collection of tales about Elisha, the successor of Elijah.

The Mind of Christ on Moral Problems of To-day.

Socialism.

By Herbert G. Wood, Selly Oak, Birmingham.

'Jesus was the greatest Socialist that ever lived' is a sentiment frequently heard in Adult School circles and in Labour Churches. It has behind it the sound conviction of the skilled artisans that the Carpenter of Nazareth belongs to them, that He must care about social injustice and endorse their claims for fuller, freer life, and that His quarrel with Pharisaism means at least the condemnation of all social snobbery. When an attempt is made to go further and to claim the patronage of Christ for Socialism in some more clearly defined sense, questions arise which are not easily answered, and doubts emerge which are not easily stilled. Such doubts do not indeed trouble the out-and-out Marxist. He is convinced that Christianity must have begun as a revolutionary communist movement of an economically oppressed class, and then have been captured, deflated, and transformed by the more respectable adherents, who so watered down and glossed over the New Testament that they turned the noblest manifesto of Socialism into the meanest defence of private property. That primitive Christianity slowed down and lost something of its first fine careless rapture is as true as it was inevitable. But the evidence of a complete moral volte-face on social and economic issues in the early Church is still to seek.

It is natural that social reformers should wish to secure Christ as their ally. He must, we think, have seen social wrongs exactly as we see them, and have perceived the truth of just that analysis of the situation which appeals to us. If we accept the Marxist theory of the exploitation of labour, we are readily convinced that Jesus must have accepted it also, and it is not difficult to read it into the parable of Dives and Lazarus. Does not the story mean that Jesus saw how impossible it is to have great riches at one end of the social scale without dire poverty at the other? The want of Lazarus is the foundation of the wealth of Dives, and the callousness of Dives is the more heinous because his wealth was the outcome of social injustice. Dives goes to hell just because he is rich, and Lazarus is recompensed in heaven for his sheer poverty. It is not a far cry from such an interpretation to the view that in principle our Lord must have been committed to the abolition of private property in capital, or to Mr. Bernard Shaw's theory of economic equality as the essence of the social commonwealth. Yet we have to admit that Jesus was not face to face with our modern problem, and before we can hope to reach the mind of Christ for to-day, we must try to understand the historical problem of the relation of Jesus to the social and economic situation of His own people.

The starting-point for such a study may well be found in a passage from St. Luke's Gospel (12^{13-21}). An individual with a grievance asked Jesus to secure redress for him, and met with a curt refusal. He said to Jesus, 'Teacher, tell my brother to share the inheritance with me.' In reply Jesus said, 'Fellow, who has appointed me as a judge or arbitrator over you?' Then Jesus turned to the crowd and bade them beware of covetousness. He added the parable of the man whose wealth increased, and whose one idea was to add to his accommodation and build larger storehouses. To this incident the nervous bourgeois constantly appeals as proof positive that Jesus had no sympathy with Socialist proposals for a redistribution of wealth. But this rests on the assumption that the man who appealed was one of the have-nots with no legal claim to his share in the inheritance. The assumption is without justification. The appellant was more probably a defender of the rights of private property, and may well have belonged to the Ratepayers' Defence Association or its equivalent in the days of Jesus. The parable would have a more immediate application to the occasion which evoked it, if the good man were already comfortably off and seeking to increase his wealth by standing on his legal right of inheritance. On the other hand, it does not follow that Jesus objected to all legally secured rights of property, or was indifferent to economic justice, because He declined to do what the man asked. Jesus does not say that there ought not to be any judge or divider; He does not say that His followers could never be concerned with administering the law of inheritance. He only denies that this is any part of His own function. There are duly appointed judges. Let the disgruntled suitor appeal to them. Why should he drag Jesus into the business?

It may be noted in passing that this saying of Jesus does seem to throw a significant light on His conception of His mission. One form of the Messianic hope depicted the national deliverer as a prophet like unto Moses. The functions of judge and arbitrator were assumed by Moses, and surely the Messiah, when He comes, ought to do what Moses did. But Jesus does not conceive His rôle after this fashion. Certainly the maintenance of law and order, or the settlement of conflicting human claims to material goods, is no essential part of His own work. As has been already suggested, this does not mean that Christians can have no duties or responsibilities in these issues, but it does perhaps imply that the Church, as such, is not called upon to act as judge or divider.

More definitely the passage indicates that Jesus thought men overvalued material wealth. His teaching is applied directly to the rich, though it is also meant for all. To Jesus, riches apparently were a source of moral danger to their possessors. They tend to put barriers between man and God, between man and man. The rich are inclined to distrust God because they are consumed with anxiety and the cares of this world. Their own higher interests they forget in the pursuit of wealth. Towards their poorer fellows they become, if not insolent, then unsympathetic. It is hard for those who trust in riches to enter the kingdom. Yet in all the references to wealth and to rich men in the Gospels, Jesus says very little about social injustice in the amassing of wealth. Of the danger of great possessions He has much to say; of wrongful acquisition, comparatively little. Even the Cleansing of the Temple court seems to have been the assertion of the spiritual privileges of the Gentiles in the house of prayer rather than a protest against dishonest trade. Compared with the earlier prophets, Jesus is almost silent about economic and social wrongs. The clearest echo of Old Testament teaching will be found in the letter of James rather than in the Gospels. Yet we must not exaggerate this difference in emphasis. The burdens which the lawyers and the Pharisees bind upon the people are in part financial, and among sins attributed to the same leaders and denounced by Jesus are sins of rapacity—the devouring of widows' houses and the like. Among the weightier things of the Law which the pedantic so easily overlook is justice, and here Jesus reaffirms the message of Micah. Moreover, the coming of Jesus was felt to be an exaltation of the humble and meek, and a rebuke to the rich and mighty, while Jesus in the Synagogue at Nazareth declared Himself to be entrusted with the deliverance of the captive and the freeing of the oppressed.

Manifestly, Jesus claimed to fulfil and complete the social gospel of the great prophets, and yet for the content of that gospel we must have recourse to the books of the prophets rather than to the sayings of Jesus. The latter contain but little denunciation of social wrongs—a curious feature of the tradition if the Marxist theory of the origins of Christianity had any relation to facts. Even more surprising is the objective way in which Jesus refers in His parables to economic conditions and practices which He cannot have approved. We can picture the social and economic background to the life of Jesus the more accurately because He so often described aspects of it without denunciation. Readers are even a little scandalized that Jesus should have drawn lessons from the conduct of indolent judges and fraudulent stewards, He appears to have reserved denunciation for pride, unreality, and obscurantism in religion. He neither declaimed against the tyranny of Rome nor emulated the prophets in inveighing against the rich, though His quarrel with the rich was deeper even than theirs. If, then, Jesus came to take away oppression, it would seem that His method and spirit were not exactly identical even with the spirit and method of His forerunners.

Perhaps the warning against covetousness suggests a line of approach to the problems of economic injustice. In effect, Jesus advises the claimant to a share in the inheritance to begin further back. If he and his brother could get rid of covetousness, they would easily obtain justice. Self-examination and self-discipline would be the stepping-stones of social progress. Negatively, to consider the beam in one's own eye would be Christ's way of advance. Positively, to love one's neighbour as one's self, to consider the other man's interests, is the true road to the city of God. An employers' association that cared more for the public service and the welfare of employees than for actual profits, and a trade union that put true efficiency before the maintenance even of the workers' standard of living, would come near to fulfilling the law of Christ. In the triad, liberty, equality, and fraternity, I think Jesus would put the emphasis on the last. To try to secure brotherhood by enforcing economic equality is like seeking first other things and hoping that the kingdom of heaven will be added.

One further and even more fundamental point may be mentioned as distinctive of the spirit and method of Jesus. The spirit that James Nayler felt, the spirit 'that delights to do no evil, nor to revenge any wrong, but delights to endure all things, in hope to enjoy its own in the end,' is surely the spirit of Christ Himself. If Jesus condemned the tyranny of Rome, and all other forms of social wrong, He proposed 'to take His own kingdom with entreaty and not with contention, and to keep it by lowliness of mind.' Behind this apparent quiescence in the face of oppression lies the mystery of the Cross itself, to which Crashaw's lines apply:

> Love's passives are his activ'st part;
> The wounded is the wounding heart.

We may now try to relate these impressions of the attitude of Jesus to our modern social problems, and to the proposals that are grouped under the name of Socialism. We are all Socialists now, in the vague sense that most men realize more or less vividly the new possibilities of State action under modern conditions. The State's contribution to the good life is no longer the negative one of defence against aggression from without or disturbance from within. In education, in particular, and in health-services, the State promotes social welfare more positively than radical thinkers of the old *laissez-faire* order would ever have thought desirable or even possible. It becomes necessary for the State to work with private enterprise in industry, if not to control or supplant it. In so far as this development does actually tend to mitigate or eliminate degrading poverty, the Christian cannot but rejoice in it. But much yet remains to be done, and what is to be the Christian judgment on more far-reaching proposals?

On these issues the Christian thinker must hesitate to claim to have a word of the Lord, and must be prepared humbly to offer his honest judgment. With much of the Socialist criticism of our existing social order I find myself in agreement. Love of wealth and the motive of private gain are still so emphasized that society may justly be described as acquisitive, and this acquisitiveness diagnosed as moral sickness. The unimaginative, trivial, and conventional way in which so many spend their incomes is a most ominous feature of the present situation. The persistence of social snobbery is also disquieting. A society which is marked by acquisitiveness, wasteful luxury, and snobbery is clearly not in accord with the mind of Christ. Happily this is not the whole truth about modern society, but it is sufficiently true to compel a Christian to endorse and re-echo many of the Socialist criticisms.

In so far as Socialism implies a belief in a co-operative commonwealth, it appears to me to have claims on the allegiance of the Christian. Christ said to His disciples: 'I have not called you servants, for a servant knoweth not what his master doeth, but I have called you friends.' This saying in itself suggests the type of co-operation in industry which can alone yield moral satisfaction to the Christian. Whether it involves the transference to industry of forms of democratic organization now in political use is more than doubtful. The Christian is not committed to any particular programme for realizing democracy in industry, but he cannot be content with an industrial system so lacking in the essentials of mutual understanding and of conscious co-operation for common ends as our present system appears to be.

To get rid of snobbery, to undermine the antagonism and want of confidence that now exist between classes, is it necessary and desirable to adopt Socialism in one or other of its familiar formulations—the public ownership of the means of production, the abolition of the private ownership of capital, or Mr. Shaw's approximately equal distribution of the national income? These solutions are attractive in that they are radical, and the evils to be attacked are deep-seated and call for radical solutions. Such proposals may, however, be open to the suspicion that they represent just that kind of action which Jesus seems to have deprecated in the Parable of the Tares. Yet Christians who accept whole-heartedly the policy of prohibition for dealing with the drink evil should think twice before they reject these Socialist measures. If the private ownership of capital does really involve serious social evils, and brings with it subtle personal temptations, then there may be as strong a case for removing this source of temptation and moral degradation as for prohibiting the drink-traffic. I am not myself convinced that the parallel is exact, but it seems sufficiently close to deserve consideration from all who believe that prohibition is the Christian way of securing temperance. But so far as my present insight goes, I think the Christian should advocate the extension of public ownership of the means of production wherever that extension can be shown to be in the public interest. I cannot see that Christianity in principle commits any one to the abolition of private property in capital, and my impression is that Socialists generally hinder the coming of the co-operative commonwealth by proclaiming as essential a formula the wisdom of which is dubious both in economics and in morals.

With regard to Mr. Shaw's proposals, I am much clearer that the existing inequality in the distribution of wealth is wrong, and implies a lack of brotherhood, than that approximate economic equality is the ideal to aim at. The primitive communism of the Jerusalem Church was not a success, and does not seem to have had the authority of Jesus behind it. This does not mean that Christians should never attempt communist experiments in future, but once again they are not committed to communism in principle, and the more immediate duty of the Christian citizen is to raise wages, and to utilize the tax-system to diminish economic inequality, especially in so far as such inequality can be shown to rest on injustice. Of the relation of Marxist Communism to Christianity it is hardly necessary to write. A Christian may well follow with interest, and even sympathy, many of the social experiments which the Bolsheviks are conducting in Russia, but their philosophy will certainly seem to be as false as their methods of violence are wrong. It is not, however, the main duty of a Christian man to sit in judgment on Bolsheviks in Russia, but to show that we in England have enough Christianity and scientific knowledge to realize more fully a finer social ideal than Communism.

It may be with confidence affirmed that Christianity is less concerned with defining the ideal form of society than with the spirit in which we seek to promote it. In the ideal Christian society, the strong will bear the burdens of the weak without, however, sapping their manhood by relieving them of all their responsibilities. What we call social problems resolve themselves at long last into personal relations, in which we can only discharge our duties to our neighbours, if we set the right valuation on human personality. The Christian must always be coming back to this fundamental truth, and it should make him as intolerant in the face of evils as cautious in dealing with short-cuts which promise to do everything *for* the people but nothing *by* the people. The surest guide to the mind of Christ in all these matters may be the well-known sentence with which John Woolman concluded his word of remembrance to the rich: 'To labour for a perfect redemption from this spirit of oppression is the great business of the whole family of Christ in this world.'

Entre Nous.

Some Notes on Death and Immortality in Literature.

In some months' desultory reading we have felt it to be worth while to note down observations and comments about Death and Immortality, a subject of such passionate, universal interest that the utterances of all sorts and conditions of men and women concerning it have value; and sayings in books half-forgotten may be well worth pondering afresh. (' Souls can't be lost any more than heat or energy.')

Newspapers, to begin with, very often contain interesting comments upon dying. One of the Sunday journals told us that shortly before Herr Stresemann died he had quoted a remark made by Blücher, brave and calm: 'I know it is late in the evening, but I do not fear the night.'

That steadfast sentence instantly brings up the vision of Lord Morley full thirty years before he died, just crossing Piccadilly Circus with his wife and T. P. O'Connor, after one of his very successful political meetings. T. P., in an Irish reaction, spoke of Death among the incongruous crowds and lights, and Morley instantly replied, 'Well, I am ready!'

This readiness to go is often experienced, it seems, just before death. That poor Russian, Makarov, ex-Minister of the Interior, in prison a few hours before his execution, said earnestly to a lady also in prison: 'Continue to cherish beauty in all its forms. Even when life is hideous we must not let its hideousness swamp us. Whatever ordeal there may be in store for us, there is one thing that is unattainable to our inquisitors, they cannot touch the soul, it soars high above their petty hatred, and I firmly believe it will live in the Great Beyond.'

Among the most confident pronouncements uttered immediately before death is this, by the late Dr. Meyer; a letter so remarkable that it can surely never be forgotten by the Christian Church. Dr. Hubert Simpson read it aloud in Westminster Congregational Church just after the old saint passed. 'Dear ——, I have just heard to my surprise that I have only a few days to live. It may be that before this reaches you I shall have entered the Palace. Don't trouble to write. We shall meet in the Morning.—With much love, Yours affectionately.' Could there be anything more serene than this?

Ah, this reading of a year, what a harvest it yields on the subject, and how the biographies speak! One can picture a certain Baroness Rothschild feeling the approach of death and able to perform all the ritual ablutions according to Jewish law, her thin lips firm. Switched over to *Vanamee*, the life of a merry and brisk young American parson, which his wife has written with great delicacy of understanding, we see him lying on his deathbed behind the French lines, finished by wounds; scribbling painfully to his wife the last letter she lets us see, perchance the very last he wrote, before his strength failed.

'There is apparently a very fair chance that there won't be anything of me to come back to you—except perhaps in spirit—thus to walk through life together, even as we have these last wonderful years. Somehow I am very happy about everything; sorry as the dickens for my little girl if she, as almost always in the past, again draws the harder burdens of the two. God bless and keep you my Molly, my wife.' Of course the war books are full of the nearness of death: notably *Grischa* and *Remarque*.

From the biography of *Vanamee* one sees how, at home, this young pastor seemed to take the very best line to comfort his flock who were ill, and had to face the worst.

'People wanted him with them when they were dying, he was so cheerful and casual, so tender and strong, as if he was seeing them off on the simplest adventure. "Well, Joe," he would say, "you'll know all about it before the rest of us." To his own mother-in-law, full of pain and terror: "It looks, Parker, as if I were not going to get better." "Well, there are lots of good people over there," he rejoined, and she glowed.'

The next note comes from *The Fight for Everest*, and this is an adequate epitaph for Irvine and Mallory:

'Yesterday with all the vigour and will of perfect manhood they were playing a great game, their life's desire. To-day it was over, and they had gone, without their ever knowing the beginnings of decay. Could any men desire a better end?'

Walter Raleigh, the beloved Professor, writes of the death of a dear one: 'I think perhaps it's all right. It's rather luxurious to ask for more value in a life than there was in Arthur's.'

And another author (A. C. Benson) writes freely in his Journal: 'I dread the idea of death very much . . . yet I don't believe it is very dreadful. . . . You know the wonderful letters written by Sterling on his death-bed to Carlyle? I dread dying as I should dread being told that I was to start to China to live the rest of my life there. The unknown is so full of terror.'

Gerhardi, the young cynic, has some good things on death in *The Polyglots*. 'The thought of death, the complete annihilation of my "I," is as unnatural and impossible as eating myself up and leaving no crumbs behind.'

'Darling, do talk of something interesting . . . something which it is easier to understand,' Sylvia demurred.

'You believe in immortality?' says some one else.

'I have not sufficient data not to believe it. It is no less a miracle that I should exist in a body than that I should exist without one. Your limited knowledge stops short this side of death, and you give your verdict in favour of this knowledge. But for me to believe that death is the end is like giving a verdict in the absence of innumerable witnesses to the contrary, who have been prevented from appearing by some flood or fires. . . .'

Gerhardi is very tender and dreamy over the death at sea of a little girl. They cast her body into the deep blue-green waters. 'Natasha lay perfectly still, and her closed lids made her faint brows look the more naïve, tender, and touching. She looked like a wax doll.

'The sky was a pellucid mother-of-pearl . . . as if through all the shadows and clouds, the suffering, confusion, and doubts, God still smiled. And curling up into vistas of space it spoke of what is beyond time, beyond loss, and the need of redemption.'

Turgenev is quoted then: 'Can it be that love, holy devoted love, is not all potent? Oh no. However passionate, sinful, rebellious may be the heart that has taken refuge in the grave, the flowers which grow upon it gaze tranquilly at us with their innocent eyes; not alone of eternal repose do they speak to us, of that mighty repose of dispassionate nature; they speak also of eternal reconciliation, and of life everlasting.'

It is good to re-read some words of Newman in the sympathetic Life of the Cardinal by Mr. Lewis May. He wrote to a dying nun:

'God's Angel will be with you every step you take —and I will try and help you . . . as you descend into the valley; but you are to be envied, not lamented over, because you are going to your own Lord and God, your Light, your Treasure, your Life. Only pray for me in your place of places and rest, for I at most can be but a little time behind you.'

'Do I believe in Eternal Life?' said Harold Begbie, to a friend of the writer. (It was a first meeting, but they understood each other at once.) 'I believe Eternal Life is a gift, ready for all who desire it with their whole heart.'

Constance Miles.

Sheer, Surrey.

A Message for the New Year.

O Christ,
With Thee we would launch forth to-day
On the dim and mist-shrouded sea of the future,
Knowing not what these mists conceal,
But anxious only that Thy great will may find
fulfilment through us:

Be Thou our Pilot,
We give to Thy hands the rudder;
Steer for us always this barque of our lives.
We would look to Thy Cross,
To Thy courage in face of disaster,
To Thy love for Thy craven friends, unstinting
unto the end,
To Thy loyal service of duty, regardless of pain
and loss,
To Thy free pouring forth of Thy life for God and
for man:

O Christ,
Make us a little as Thou art,
Breed in us, Master, a little of this Thy Spirit,
Rule our lives
By the hand that was spiked to the Cross.

Several of the books of the Rev. J. S. Hoyland, M.A., have been noticed in this magazine. This *vers libre* is from *The Divine Companionship*, just published by the Student Christian Movement (2s. 6d. net).

Mahatma Gandhi's Ideas.

'It would be possible to write a learned book on Buddhism which should recite the various facts with scholarly exactness, yet leave the reader at the end wondering how intelligent and spiritual men and women of our day could really be Buddhists. I have sought to avoid this effect and have tried to enable the reader to understand a little *how it feels to be a Buddhist*. To give the feelings of an alien religion it is necessary to do more than expound its concepts and describe its history. One must catch its emotional undertone, enter sympathetically into its sentiment, feel one's way into its symbols, its cult, its art, and then seek to impart these not merely by scientific exposition but in all sorts of indirect ways.' This is what Dr. Pratt, the Professor of Philosophy in Williams College, says about his own approach to Buddhism. It exactly expresses what C. F. Andrews has done for Hinduism and the ideas of Gandhi. The volume with the title *Mahatma Gandhi's Ideas* which Mr. Andrews has just published is the first of two. This first volume deals with the main ideas of the man whose close friend C. F. Andrews has been for over fifteen years.

One of Gandhi's leading ideas is Swadeshi, which he himself defines in this way: 'Swadeshi is that spirit within us which restricts us to the use and service of our immediate surroundings to the exclusion of the more remote.' So in the matter of religion a man should restrict himself to his ancestral religion, and where it is defective purge it of its defects. In the field of economics it means that he would use only those things that are produced by his immediate neighbours. 'India cannot live for Lancashire, or any other country, before she is able to live for herself; and she can live for herself only if she produces everything for her own requirements within her own borders.' He is strongly opposed to a marriage outside caste. 'Our present existence is a discipline which has to be lived within certain rules suited to this special stage.' But he does not believe in the artificial multiplication of castes as found in India to-day, nor in the evil of untouchability—Gandhi himself, after a struggle with his wife, adopted into his own family a little untouchable child.

One of the most interesting chapters is on Gandhi's teaching of Ahimsa or Non-Violence, a virtue which involves the positive doing of good, quite as much as the negative refusal to do harm. The chapter is specially interesting because it contains Mr. Andrews' criticism—he has always been a pacifist—of Gandhi's participation in the Boer War and the Great War. Mr. Andrews says shortly that while he quotes Gandhi's argument regarding war it does not convince or satisfy him. The publishers of this enlightening and valuable survey are Messrs. Allen & Unwin, and the price 12s. 6d. net.

The Cinder Paths.

'A good old friend of mine was fond of praying a very curious prayer. Whenever I heard him offer a prayer—and he very often did so at the prayer meetings of the church I went to as a boy —I always used to listen for it, and it nearly always came. "Lord," he would say, "help us to re-cinder our paths." What did he mean? I shall have to explain. In the little town where he lived the sidewalks were usually made of cinders brought from the furnaces of the salt factories, for it was a salt-making town. Very good hard paths they made, too, once they were well trodden down; but they soon got worn and had to be renewed from time to time with fresh cinders. That is what my old friend was thinking about, and he was praying that God would help him to keep all the paths of his life, all the ways in which he walked, in good condition—paths of righteousness, and truth, and goodness. It was a very good prayer he so often prayed: "Lord, help us to re-cinder our paths." When the paths of our little town were re-cindered, the workmen simply spread the new cinders all over the worn surface of the old pathway, but they did not use any roller to roll them in. They just left them to be trodden in by the feet of the passers-by, and it was not at all pleasant walking on these loose cinders just after the paths had been repaired. I well remember walking with my old friend along a newly cindered path and saying to him, "Let's walk in the road." "No, lad," he replied in his rich Cheshire brogue, "let's keep on t' path! Somebody else'll have to tread 'em if we don't."

'I have often thought of that, and it has often made me ask myself whether I am doing my bit in helping to make the rough places smooth upon the way of life. Do you ever think of those who have done that for us? There are so many paths that are smooth for us to-day because of others who went before us and who bravely and patiently trod the rough places. I think of all the noble men and women who suffered persecution and loss that they might open up the paths of liberty and human rights. I think of Jesus Christ Himself dying on the Cross to make the way of righteousness and goodness easier for us all. How much we owe to those who have done all this for us! How can we repay them? By doing our bit to-day to make the world we live in a better, kinder, and more peaceful place. There are still plenty of rough places in the world.'

This is quoted from *At the Gate called Beautiful*, a volume of children's addresses by the Rev. O. G. Whitfield (Hodder & Stoughton; 3s. 6d. net). He offers them as a small contribution to the common material of all those who have to speak to boys and girls. The quoted address shows the matter. The binding is artistic, and there is a charming paper jacket.

Printed by Morrison & Gibb Limited, Tanfield Works, and Published by T. & T. Clark, 38 George Street, Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to The Editor, Kings Gate, Aberdeen, Scotland.

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

In his recent book, reviewed last month, on *The New Testament in the Light of Modern Research*, Professor Deissmann has an interesting chapter on 'The New Testament in World History,' in which he traces the paths along which the New Testament has travelled in its victorious career. *Habent sua fata libelli*, and surely no single book in the whole library of mankind has had *fata* so extensive and intensive as the New Testament. It is the Book of Humanity because it began by being the Book of the People and has become the Book of the Peoples.

The first high road of the New Testament is the one leading out of obscurity into the big, wide world. In the middle of the second century the Christian literature lay in the quiet custody of Christian brotherhoods. The number of copies would not be more than a few hundred. A local church would have one or two. But no part of an original manuscript of this period has come down to us. In the third century there were probably thousands of copies in circulation, but large numbers were given up to the authorities and destroyed. We have small original fragments of the Greek Bible of this period in pieces of papyrus. In the fourth century, when Christianity had conquered the world, the number of copies must have been large, and we have entire manuscripts of the New Testament, richly ornamented.

Then the victorious march of the New Testament began. It came to the Syrians, Copts, Ethiopians, Arabs, Armenians, and other Orientals, and soon it was dressed in the curious garb of all these languages. From the East it came to the West in the Latin Bible, which is a westernized book. And then the New Testament spread up to the north-European peoples. The first Germanic Bible was that of Ulfilas, and this was followed by Slavonic translations, and these by Scandinavian and Celtic. But there were two Western translations that have been regarded as World Bibles—the German translation of Luther and the English Bible. Luther made the New Testament again the book of the people, and for its march through the great new world laid open by discoverers and explorers the New Testament put on the garment of the English language.

With the opening up of international communications began a new era in the history of the New Testament through innumerable translations. The British and Foreign Bible Society has translated the Bible or parts of it into six hundred and eighteen languages, and if we include the work of other societies, the number would have to be raised to eight hundred and forty. The Society referred to has circulated about three hundred and seventy-five million copies, and the American Society has circulated about two hundred and five million. No book has travelled such a mileage as the New Testament; none has reached so many eyes and ears.

Another high road along which the New Testa-

Vol. XLI.—No. 5.—February 1930.

ment has travelled is the way up from the simple to the educated. This has not been described as the other has. Yet this ascent is one of the great chapters in the history of man's culture. The book came from the souls of simple men. But the living force pushed upward. In the middle of the second century the book was in the hands of the learned. Christian scribes began to deal with the New Testament much in the same way as the Rabbis dealt with the Old Testament. And from that time to the rise of exegetical and historical criticism the work has gone on. To-day there are four or five hundred Chairs for the study of the New Testament at about three hundred different places.

This has meant a great danger to the New Testament, the same danger that happens to a flower when a learned man plucks it and puts it in an herbarium. And often it has seemed as if mountains of paper would bury the New Testament and clouds of dust suffocate it. There has often appeared a doctrinaire way of estimating it. A theological system has been formed from the flowing and ebbing religious life of the New Testament, from Paul a 'Paulinism,' from Christ a 'Christology.' And so we get a distorted and lifeless picture of early Christianity. Everything is dogmatized and conventionalized. That which came from the mind of saints in the sunny East, in the open air and sunlight, is exiled to the wooden tables and Osram lamps of Western authorities.

But there is another side. Scholarship has often cut a way into the heart of the little book through the labyrinth of tradition. It has restored the original text and has led us back to the sources. It has protected the Holy Book from fanatics, legalists, and confused thinkers. 'The old tongues are the sheaths in which the knife of the spirit is put,' said Goethe, and scholarship has often been this knife that has cut in to the truth.

But there is a third high road along which the New Testament has travelled, a way of influence over the spiritual history of mankind. Professor Deissmann glances at some of the spheres of this influence. There is Art, for example. This is too obvious to need development. Then there is Law, for in marriage law, criminal law, and civil law alike there is to be traced a deep New Testament mark. But the deepest influence is seen in the religious life of humanity, a subject so vast that it could only be indicated.

You can see this influence in the Epochs of Recovery, when out of the darkness a new light has shone forth. Think of the rediscovery of grace by Augustine, the vision of St. Francis, the discovery of a free way to God by Luther, the emergence of Wesley. It is always the same, always some great word of the New Testament that starts out to make a new world. And think most of all of the countless souls to which the New Testament has brought liberty, peace, and power. This, the greatest chapter in its history, can never be written, except in 'the lamb's book of life.' 'Therefore,' concludes Dr. Deissmann, 'we can put the wonderful history of the Book of Humanity in one sentence: the New Testament has become the Book of the Peoples because it began by being the Book of the People.'

It would be a pity if the interesting and stimulating essay by Abraham Cronbach which concludes the very erudite discussions in volume v. of the Hebrew Union College Annual for 1928, noticed elsewhere in this number, should be overlooked because it happens to appear in a volume which, as devoted almost exclusively to things Jewish, is little likely to find its way to that larger public which this particular essay particularly concerns. The essay is entitled 'Divine Help as a Social Phenomenon'; it might, perhaps, have been equally entitled 'Social Help as a Divine Phenomenon.'

For the central thought of the essay turns on the meaning to be attached to the words 'God' and 'divine.' Both these terms, Dr. Cronbach argues, are ambiguous, or at any rate they may be, and are, used in a variety of ways. When, for example, we speak of Divine help, 'divine' may be taken to mean 'supernatural' in relation to the cause of the help, or 'valuable' in relation to the ideal advanced by it, or 'religious,' in relation to the psychological expedients, such as prayer, employed to bring it about.

Similarly, a distinction is to be drawn between the God of worship and the God of customary theology. It would of course be folly to affirm that between these two there is a great gulf fixed; in the end, if the thinker is a really devout person, these two must be one. But equally it would be folly to deny that the atmosphere pervading these conceptions is different; the thinker, excogitating his theological system, could seldom claim to be in quite the same mood as when he is singing the praises of God in the sanctuary. It is the difference between 'the Rock of Ages,' 'the King of Love,' 'Sun of my Soul' on the one hand, and 'the First Cause,' 'the Great Hypothesis,' 'the Underlying Substance' on the other.

This essay is in part a plea for what the writer calls the 'evaluative,' as contrasted with the causative and supernaturalistic, idea of God. In other words, 'the dominant meaning of God is supreme value.' He is to be regarded as the supreme ideal rather than as supernatural cause; He is to be thought of no longer as the supernatural origin, but as the idealistic goal. This conception of Him is confirmed by all the highest flights of religious poetry, and notably of Hebrew religious poetry, where occur such great utterances as these: 'With Thee is the fountain of life, in Thy light shall we see light,' 'As the hart panteth after the water-brooks, so panteth my soul after Thee, O God,' 'My soul longeth for God, for the living God,' 'The Lord is my light and my salvation.' In utterances such as these 'God ceases to be the alleged means towards an end and becomes Himself the end.'

That is to say, essentially God represents value. When we speak of God as love, truth, or justice, what we really mean is that God is *the value realized when human interactions exemplify* love, truth, or justice. The italics are Dr. CRONBACH's, and this sentence succinctly summarizes his argument; but we may be pardoned for wondering whether such a definition of God would have satisfied the psalmists or the prophets. It is not impossible that they meant something other than they seem to say, but surely their relation to God was something warmer, more direct and intimate than that.

The writer comes to grips with his subject when he begins to discuss human need, in relation to which his contention is that help which is Divine in its importance may be social as to its cause. What did the psalmist mean, for example, when he said, 'If it had not been the Lord who was on our side, when men rose up against us, then they had swallowed us up alive, when their wrath was kindled against us'? The help—so runs the argument—was really human help; its divinity lay not in its cause, but in its value. The human friends constituted the Divine help, so that we have 'a social causation for the rescue from social hostility.'

And even where physical help fails or is absent, the sufferer may be sustained by a 'social presence,' which is something vaster than physical presence. The thought of the unseen friends, whose presence is 'unbounded in time or space,' is a spiritual factor of great and beneficent potency. It was this that sustained Edith Cavell when she was in the hands of her foes, and the hunted Elisha when he said, 'They that be with us are more than they that be with them.' As the writer suggestively says, 'Beyond the hostile Syrian cordon is the infinite and eternal social situation where Elisha has the victory.'

But besides the need of aid against concrete hostility, there is the need of spiritual aid. Is this aid, when it comes, Divine in the causative sense, or is it socially mediated? Here, again, it is for the latter sense that Dr. CRONBACH pleads. In the voice of an inspiring teacher, preacher, or companion, we sometimes confess that we have heard the voice of God. Such a statement, however, says the writer, is misleading if the word 'God' is taken in its causal sense; but it is literally true when the word carries the sense of value, supreme, superlative value. This is the sense, he maintains, 'in which God is the comforter of sorrow, a strengthener against temptation, a cleanser of the heart, and the essence of that moral rehabilitation which is traditionally called the forgiveness of sin.' But again we ask, Is that all? Did the psalmists, the prophets, Jesus, Paul, and indeed all the great masters of the religious life not believe that God could and did speak directly to their hearts?

We take leave to doubt whether the intensely personal experiences of religious men, who are in their sublimer moments as conscious of the personality of God as they are of their own personality, can be volatilized in this way into experiences essentially social. In terms of social psychology, we are told 'the peace of God which passeth understanding' is 'of God' in the sense of its being 'wholesome, excellent, desirable, an exceptional embodiment of value.' But is this really all?

The climax of this 'social' interpretation of religious phenomena is reached when the writer comes to what, with rather ominous significance, he calls 'the reputed efficacy of prayer' that one person offers for another. We can agree with him when he asserts that prayer is the manifestation of one's interest in another, of goodwill, appreciation, esteem. But we emphatically demur when he goes on to say, '"Pray for me" denotes: "Take an interest in me. Be concerned about me. Influence me helpfully." The benefit of the prayer lies in the beneficence of the one who offers the prayer, while the God addressed in the prayer is that supreme good which, through it all, is being visaged and approached.' This is a courageous attempt to explain intercessory prayer, but to the average devout person it will seem pathetically inadequate.

But whatever strictures one may pass on this suggestive essay, it is searching, challenging, and valuable in an eminent degree. Its contention that 'not causation but value is the meaning of Divinity,' when applied to programmes of social amelioration, sets these programmes in a radiant light. For it comes to this, that not only prophets but benefactors are messengers of God, and God Himself is really present in all worthy attempts to advance human welfare. In seeking and finding the social good, men are seeking and finding God. But the social good must be recognized as involving the things of supreme value; it must not be conceived purely as food, drink, comfort, and relief from physical distress. Benevolence must have an idealistic motive: it must, in the last analysis, have as its aim the bringing of the sufferer to God. Or, as Dr. Cronbach puts it, 'The soul, and not merely the flesh, must be the aim of all social endeavour.'

No passage of the Bible is more familiar than St. Paul's rapturous hymn of love in the thirteenth chapter of First Corinthians, and no words of that chapter better sum up the meaning of the whole than these three simple words from the eighth verse, 'Charity never faileth.' Simple words, yet great in their simplicity. For not only do they contain the gist of the classic passage which is their context, they set forth the deepest and most adequate principle of the moral life.

It is a commonplace among exponents of our Lord's moral teaching that He bequeathed to the world no code of morals, no system of ethics, but certain fundamental principles. Standing at a point of history, He could not have legislated in detail for all succeeding ages, and it would not be desirable that He should have done so: that would have been to impair, in Luther's phrase, the glorious 'freedom of the Christian man.' Nor need we regret that He did not present His moral teaching in abstract system. No abstract system, however rounded or complete, can compare in human interest and appeal with the Parables of the Gospels and the Sermon on the Mount. A few great principles enforced by aphorism and paradox, or translated into separate precepts and invested with a wealth of illustrative detail, such was the way of Jesus.

Now of the various principles of life laid down by Him the greatest and most fundamental is, as every one knows, the principle of universal love. It is the principle which St. Paul catches up in 1 Co 13 and sends down the ages in a deathless chant. And what the Apostle says in v.[8] is that love is an unfailing principle, in the sense that it will always be found adequate to sustain highest and noblest living, that it will be found applicable and sufficient in every kind of circumstance and to every problem of duty; it is the wellspring of the virtues, the touchstone of true character and conduct, the master-key which unlocks, swiftly and unerringly, those multifarious chambers wherein the human consciousness is called upon to live and be at peace.

Have other moral teachers besides Christ upheld, independently of Him, the adequacy and sufficiency of the principle of universal love? The inquiry is chiefly one of academic interest. It does not detract from the ethical value of the principle of universal love, nor from the authority of Jesus as a moral teacher, that it may be found clearly expressed, for example, in writers of the Stoic school of philosophy, such as Seneca or Marcus Aurelius. After all, it was the Christian religion, and not the Stoic or any other philosophy, which converted the world to the ethics of impartial love and brotherhood; and that is a point of decisive importance in any discussion of the comparative merits of Jesus and other masters of antiquity.

Far more important for the Christian apologist than any vindication of the personal and historical greatness of Christ as a moral teacher is the repudiation of certain current moralities to which our human nature is all too prone to respond, which would have us revert to ideals of naturalism and paganism—sometimes exalting æsthetic culture above humanity and charity; sometimes glorifying selfishness and the blatant assertion of individuality, and minimizing self-sacrifice as mean and contemptible. It is difficult to estimate, but one may easily underestimate, the influence of the moral teaching of that wayward genius Nietzsche in precipitating the crisis of the recent war, with his doctrine—which became so widely canvassed—of pure egoism and the rightful dominance of the strong.

But while the Christian apologist should seek to uphold against present-day detractors the principle of brotherly love as the basic principle of all true morality, he should uphold it in a sense that is reasonably possible. When Christ, and the higher moralists generally, bid us love all men impartially, they are not asking us to feel towards human beings in general exactly as we feel towards our nearest friends and relations. That would be to make an impossible demand. Most moralists appear to recognize two distinct senses of love. They distinguish between the affection which is a special attachment to particular persons, being naturally based on preferences and intimacies, and the affection which is a general direction of the will and desires.

It is a distinction of which our Lord's own life furnishes an illustration. The general direction of His will was towards the universal welfare of humanity. Yet, as we are told, He expressed special feelings of affection towards certain individuals. He loved the young man of great possessions who sought of Him the way of eternal life. He loved Lazarus of Bethany, and his sisters Martha and Mary. He loved one of the Twelve. And who that has stood by Calvary and listened to the Saviour's last words could ever believe that when He forsook His kindred and friends at Nazareth, 'hating' them—to use His own vivid, paradoxical phrase—for the Kingdom's sake, He there and then dislodged them from a special place in His affections? We may be sure that in His homeless wayfarings He was often solaced by the memory of Mary His mother, whom in His last farewell He entrusted to the care of the beloved disciple.

It is altogether natural that a general attitude of sympathy and benevolence towards mankind should as it were be punctuated by feelings of vivid personal affection towards particular individuals and by corresponding words and actions. It is largely, though not entirely, through the interest we show in particular individuals and the services we render to them that our love of humanity shows itself.

For the rest, love is adequate both for the life which now is and for that which is to come. Prophecies and tongues shall cease, knowledge shall vanish away, but love is a principle of eternal value, and shall endure for ever. As love is a component of the eternal life realizable here and now, so it enters into the eternal life which shall be realized beyond the veil. As even in the present we pass out of death into life because we love the brethren, so in the future we shall find a heaven of moral opportunity, of wider horizons, of larger and enlarging service.

The Words from the Cross.

III. 'Woman, behold thy son! . . . Behold thy mother!' (Jn. xix. 26, 27).

By Professor A. J. Gossip, D.D., Glasgow.

If the editors will chivalrously give me leave to say so, frankly I dislike and shrink from sermons upon the Words from the Cross—have never yet, I think, been guilty of them—and, if my copy of this magazine fell open at this page, would never dream of pausing at it, but would hurriedly pass on to something else; which, with all gravity, I advise you too to do.

For if in some august cathedral, with memories of mighty spirits and momentous happenings brooding in every corner, and the air athrill and instinct with the very presence of the Lord God of our fathers, the soul is jarred and outraged by the breaking in upon these sanctities of the inane comments of some loud and far-carrying Western voice, is rudely dunted back to earth by the mechanical prosing of the guide's recital, which may be true enough, but none the less is horridly inadequate and deadening and soulless, how much more out of place is it to conduct parties over Calvary, to point and whisper there, to break that awesome silence in which the Master's agony is deepening to its tremendous climax with our poor superficial comments upon sayings that are not meant, as I feel, to be taken into our hands, and turned round, and examined in cold blood, but rather to be heard upon our knees, and with hearts hushed and tensely still.

Rupert Brooke had an unspiritual nature. But once the magic of the woods laid hold on him, till the key to the solutions of this baffling life of ours seemed fairly put into his hand. Another moment, and, the closed door open at last, he would be at the vital heart of things, he felt. And just then, most inopportunely, there came a crashing through the branches, and the swishing of a skirt, and, the key lost for ever, 'a flat, clear voice' was mouthing 'cheerful, clear, flat platitudes.'

> You came and quacked beside me in the wood.
> You said, 'The view from here is very good.'
> You said, 'It's nice to be alone a bit.'
> And, 'How the days are drawing out,' you said.
> You said, 'The sunset's pretty, isn't it?'
>
> . . . .
>
> By God! I wish—I wish that you were dead!

I am uneasy and unhappy lest my intrusion also is a profanation; lest, fingering these most holy of things, I dim for some their lustre, belittle them, and hide their deeps for some unwary souls; lest outraged spirits, goaded beyond endurance, turn on me, crying out in a fierce, sheer pain, 'If not for our sake, then for God's sake, and in common decency, keep quiet here.'

Every one knows that Jeremy Taylor has two treatises, one upon Holy Living, which is still popular, one upon Holy Dying, of which nowadays little is heard. And that is symptomatic. For the centre of gravity of things has shifted notably from death to life. Once on a day men's hearts, if they were serious at all, looked forward very solemnly to that tremendous moment, surely waiting for us all, when for us life will be over, and, the dear faces round us fading from our dimming eyes, we must rise up, and go our lonely way, leaving this homely earth with its familiar ways, adventuring forth into that vast unknown, where all we thought and did and were is waiting for us, like a lovely maiden or a repulsive hag, so Zoroaster thought, to lead us to our natural destiny.

Ah! little at best can all our hopes avail us
To lift this sorrow, or cheer us, when in the dark,
Unwilling, alone we embark,
And the things we have seen and have known and
    have heard of fail us.

Or, if it is not as bad as that for a Christian man—Why should it be? How can it be?—at least all life, thought Plato, ought to be, and for a wise soul is, a long and careful preparation for that epoch-making hour. But there has come reaction. 'There is nothing,' says Spinoza, 'on which a free man lets his thoughts dwell less than on death: for true wisdom is a meditation, not on death, but on life.' The modern mind applauds that loudly. And indeed timid souls were wont to let themselves become not a little fussy and fidgety and unhealthily self-centred in this matter. Goethe, for his part, remarking that ever-recurring reminder on innumerable gravestones *Memento mori*, thought it over-grim, and psychologically unsound and pernicious. Rather be you sure you are really alive, he counselled. Not unwisely surely. For, because the evening is certain to fall, why should we not use the hours of generous sunshine now? Death must soon knock upon our door. But meantime here is this rich life that God has planned for us; let us use it eagerly and heartily and thoroughly: and here this world of men and women round us whom we can befriend and help, let us be up and at it then; and so when for us the end here comes, pass over to the other side, eager for what God's loving-kindness has ready and waiting for us there. 'Death doesn't count,' wrote Nettleship. By which I take it that he meant—here is this chapter of our life: and by and by there will result another out of it. And who bothers about the little space of blank white paper between the two? And that is all death is. It is the story that matters. Let us get on with it, and make it a brave tale. And there is truth in that.

Yet death is too majestical by far to be shouldered aside as a mere triviality. And, however I may slip in minor things, I covet to carry through that great event with dignity and honour. And who can teach, or can inspire, us so to do like Jesus Christ, our wonderful Lord, who was perfection lived; aye, and perfection died? Dear old Epictetus tells us that he had his wishes about death. Among them these. 'I should like best,' he said, 'that it should find me busy at something noble and beneficent and for the good of all mankind.' And did not Christ die for the world; and has He not, so dying, lifted it up bodily far nearer holiness and God? 'But, since that is but little likely to befall me,' adds the wise philosopher, 'I should choose next to go out rendering what is due to every relation in life.' And here is our amazing Master, saving a world and yet remembering the welfare of His mother, thinking out a home and future for her, after He was gone. So true is it that, wherever you come on Christ, and whatever test you may apply to Him, He is what the next greatest to Him only dreamed and hoped and longed to be. For think out the background of these sayings—the body racked in every limb by an excruciating agony all but past bearing; and worse, far worse, that horror of gross darkness enveloping His very soul: this whole great world's salvation hanging in the balances, dependent on His faith, tested there to the uttermost, with nothing left for it to clutch at or cling to, yet still audaciously believing. And even there, and even then, in that appalling responsibility, He had a mind lifted above Himself, serene and calm enough to think and pray, and plan for others! 'Father, forgive them.' 'This day shalt thou be with me in paradise.' 'Woman, behold thy son! Son, behold thy mother!'

Let it be granted to me in dying to have a spirit after that mighty type; unflustered, when the darkness falls, because too sure of God to dream of doubting Him; not fidgeting about itself, but lying confidently in His loving hands; not hurriedly preparing, feverishly stamping in one's goods, but packed, and waiting for the tide, with heaps of time for others; unselfish even through that last and trying scene, when even the poorest of us for once holds the centre of the stage; and with a courage big enough to smother the pain down into the silence of one's own being, to smile, and enter eagerly into the happiness and interests of those about us to the very end, thinking and planning about them, and not ourselves, after our Lord's brave way; and so prove death is not a squalid or a pitiful thing, but brave and gallant and enviable.

And how is this to be attained? Only, so I suspect, by putting on the Lord Christ now, and learning to practise His unselfishness in the small nothings of our daily living.

For does a crisis ever do more than reveal a man: does it ever really make him? Perhaps sometimes it may. That same Rupert Brooke had a nasty mind, and dirty fingers that soiled even the loveliest things he touched. Yet the war came, and, like a garment that fell from him, suddenly he stood there a clean soul, ardent for self-sacrifice.

But, as a rule, it is the habit of a lifetime that flames into vividness in the hot flames of trial. So was it with our Lord. All His days He had gone about doing good, in sheer forgetfulness of self; and so, even when they had nailed down His hands and feet, so that they could do nothing more, the habit of His life still held; and His heart, left free, ran out in its accustomed way to needy, desperate, sinful folk. And you and I, so shabby and self-centred and unlike Him, had better kneel and cry, 'Dear Lord, grant us Thy faith in God, Thy courage, something of the splendour of Thy nature, that we may learn to live and die like Thee.' And if we really mean it, and will take it, He will grant us even that.

There are those who tell us these days that our morality is a quaintly obsolete affair, a garment so preposterously old-fashioned that up-to-date people would blush to be seen wearing it: that the recognized sanctities, like marriage and the family, have had their day, and ought now to be left behind, like other barbarisms that we have outgrown: that our natural affections are only a subtle selfishness, a loving of our own, and must now be replaced by something wider, and less personal, and much more catholic. So a noisy clique keeps shouting, some of them to attract attention (still practising the stale old trick that Tolstoi pilloried forty years ago), some of them generalizing from their own mean souls or unhappy experiences without any warrant, some of them mistaking the fusty atmosphere of the divorce courts for the free air of God, all of them fancying themselves as big and very fine, and quite unconscious that the average man, fixedly regarding them, has thoroughly made up his mind they are a grubby company, and so turns home to watch his wife with the old pride, and toss his bairn with the old happiness, with no more intention of raising a hand to demolish these blessed things than of flaying himself alive from head to foot; though certain timorous souls are badly scared. Barth, for example, who is always shouting something at the full pitch of his voice, bawls this too hoarsely, with his leather lungs, that the old ethics are down, and gone!

Such revolutionaries gain no manner of support from Christ. Assuredly He underlines that there are calls of God that must come first, that take precedence of the claims even of father and mother, even of wife and child. But, on the other hand, it looks at least as if, with His heart on fire to save a world, He delayed the opening of His mission till the family duties God had laid on Him were fully met, until some other of the brothers was ready to take up His task at home. And certainly on Calvary the claims of natural affection were conceded to the full. There were many women there; but one among them was His mother, on whose lap He had heard of God, at whose knee He had learned to pray, whose love and care had filled His childhood, and of her He thought first and specially. D'Alembert alleged that he preferred his family to himself, and his nation to his family, and humanity to his nation. Which pompous saying I take leave gravely to doubt. In any case, it was not our Lord's method. Rousseau prates of the rights of man, and yet denies the plainest and most fundamental of them to his own offspring, sneaking through the dark to leave his babies on the doorstep of the foundling hospital: and with that the whole man grows suspect. For if he failed his flesh and blood, obviously he is not dependable towards any, at a pinch, whatever their rights be. But Christ, far from abolishing the natural affections, strengthened, deepened, consecrated them, and so made them a basis upon which to stand and reach out towards something wider and more general. To Him a friend is not a mere acquaintance with whom one passes the time, but one who opens his whole mind to you, and is prepared to give his life for you. That is how we are to bear ourselves towards every one. But we learn it among our friends. To Christ a grumpy brother is an abortion and monstrosity. We are to be real brothers to our fellows; and what that means ought to be taught us in the Christian family. With the responsibility of a whole desperate world's salvation weighing upon His heart, our Lord put first the simple homely duties of a son; and if we are forgetting these, can we be true to Him? Yet, as a generation, are we not so doing? Now that the door out of their old cramped life stands open, it is natural for a young woman to crave an independent income and the interest down at the office, but if her invalid mother's days are long and very dull, I wonder how Christ judges that! To vote and attend meetings and the like is for some quite exciting, but is it really patriotic to do only that, and selfishly decline to bear the burden of the next generation, with the result that there are rows and rows of bungalows each with its little garage, and its little car, and not a pram, or hardly one, among the lot; which, of course, means race suicide. Churchiness is for some a hobby, and the more meetings the merrier. But what about the folk at home? If John had reached the heavenly places, and explained that he had been so busy working for Christ and His kingdom, that he had had no time to bother about His mother, I do not think that Christ's 'Well done!' would have been very hearty. The little duties are often the hardest; yet a religion that breaks down at home is a vain thing.

> The primal duties shine aloft like stars,
> The charities that soothe, and heal, and bless,
> Are scattered at the feet of man, like flowers.

And we had better not forget that, if it was in the thick darkness upon Calvary that there flamed out the mighty constellations by which ever since humanity has steered, the homely virtues too, flower bravely on that bleak hillside. They also are a real and an essential part of Christlikeness. 'Woman, behold thy son!'

But, perhaps, in fairness this ought to be given a wider application. We are looking a little uneasily at one another in the Church these days, because we are divided into two parties, with aims dissimilar, or not quite parallel. The one lays the full emphasis upon the culture of the soul, and the upbuilding of a Christian character, thinks that, according to the standard of the Master, material things are so insignificant, that it is less than loyal to Him for His Church to spend itself to secure bigger wages or shorter hours or increased comfort for the folk around it, that while it is well enough, imperative indeed, that each of us, face to face with Christ, should feel that we must catch His spirit, and live and spend ourselves and share with others, far more than we do, it is not so well that these others should gather upon Calvary as at a kind of Hyde Park, where the disaffected air their grievances, and claim their rights, forgetting that that solemn symbol in the midst speaks, not of rights, but sacrifice; so smothering the very spirit of Christ's movement, and changing Him, against His will, into a social leader, a political reformer, anything, everything, but what He was, choosing it with deliberation over against these other things that were eagerly thrust on Him then too, a healer of the individual soul. And there are Scripture passages, whose meaning is unchallengeable, upon which such minds can found.

While the other section is so hurt by the grievous wrongs of men and women and bairns round them, by the mean streets that are their world, by the stunted existences that are their portion in this hugely fascinating earth God planned for them no less than us, crowded with interests in most of which they have too small a share, by the deadly monotony of their unchanging days, luring them into foolishness and sin which might, they think, splash some touch of colour into the dead drabness of it all, by the feeling that these who are God's children ought to have more in this that is their Father's house; and with that they leap up, and, in a clean burning anger, demand, in the name of Christ, that it must all come down, this impossible way of things, and be rebuilt really upon His law of love; like Tagore shrinking from our Western civilization as 'a thing of the devil,' beautiful upon the surface, marvellous in its mastery over mechanism and the forces of Nature, but deadening and choking to the soul. And they, too, can confidently call as witnesses Scriptures that stare at us out of both Gospel and Epistle.

Of course, it is really a question of where to lay the emphasis. With Aristotle's mean, 'the nicely calculated less or more,' our faith would seem to have nothing to do, because it is a passion, an enthusiasm, that adventures everything, and flings its very life away unreckoningly. And yet one has to pick one's path through the extremes of things on either side, or else be bogged and hindered. Long ago Philo saw these same two parties tugging against each other, as they are doing now. 'There are some,' he said, 'who have attached themselves to one of these devotions, and neglected the other. For, being filled with a sense of piety, they have preferred that to all other interests, and devoted the whole of their lives to the service of God: while others have adhered simply to their connexion with men in social zeal, affording all alike the use of their possessions, and also, as far as possible, alleviating their woes. The latter you might properly call philanthropic persons, the former devout. But they are only semi-good, for those alone are perfect who have a reputation in both departments.' But when men argue that material welfare and material rights lie outside of the province of a society which exists to bring spiritual things to men's forgetful minds, and to induce them to give life to gaining these, here in this passage is proof, is it not, that at the most awful moment of the Master's life, or indeed in the whole range of human history, with the world's last desperate chance dependent upon Him, with God and the devil fairly at grips in the decisive conflict, even then our Lord thought of His mother's comfort, planned a home for her; and if we haughtily pass by upon the other side, accounting social wrongs too trivial for our spiritual eyes to notice, may not the Christ who has told us that His followers are as dear to Him as mother or sister or brother, look at us sternly at the last, and say, 'It was Mine, yes, it was I Myself, that you passed by and left to manage as best I could alone. My brothers and my sisters, yes, Myself, you failed to help; I whom you pinned down to struggle in the mean streets, while you were praying to Me in your splendid churches; depart from Me, you who have shown you are no friends of Mine.'

Lastly, there is this to say that our Lord's mother had not made things easier for Him; had, indeed, hurt Him as no other ever did, not even the Baptist when he staggered, not even Peter when he failed, not even Judas when he fell. It was her hand that dealt Him that most cruel blow that busy day when there was a movement and a pushing out on the fringes of the crowd, and it was told Him that His mother and brethren had come for Him, were saying that there was no real harm in Him, that He must have gone off His head, but they would take Him home and keep Him safe, and He would never bother anybody any more. She loved Him, or she would not have been there upon Calvary: but she did not understand Him, at times thought that He was crazy. And He forgot all that, remembered only the old love, and the love that was breaking her heart now, and all the pain that He had had to bring into her life, and looked upon her very lovingly, and even in His agony thought out and found for her a home.

We too have failed Him shamelessly, have hurt Him far more than we know, have been just inexcusable; and He forgets all that, and treasures the poor broken bits of faith and of affection we have sometimes brought Him, chose to go to His Cross for us. I hated Him, says Paul, I persecuted Him, I gave my whole life to the rooting out of everything that He holds dear, and 'he loved me, and gave himself for me.' 'Ye have not chosen me, but I have chosen you,' He told that blundering little group who had so often hindered Him, and were upon the point of breaking altogether. I chose you, and I stand to it. And looking out at the Beyond, for Himself He asked only this, 'Father, I will that they whom thou hast given me be with me where I am,' knew He would miss them even there, had little wish for glory except that He might share it too with them.

And to us also He clings in that same unbelievably loyal way, loves on whatever we may do, will not be turned from that. And when at last we reach the other side, and stand there muddy and ashamed, and very conscious how unlike we are to all these clean and shining spirits round us, eagerly He will come to us, with outstretched hands and happy face, and let us see how much it means to Him that we are there. I know it, because I have proved it; because He has done that to me again, and yet again, and still again. And He is 'the same yesterday, and to-day, and for ever.'

Literature.

MERLE D'AUBIGNÉ.

Surely it is an unhappy fact that it is only now, nearly sixty years after his death, that there appears the life of Merle D'Aubigné. Had it been published fifty years ago, there would have been an uncountable public eagerly waiting for it. For the famous History of the Reformation simply swept the world, and ran like wild-fire through the earth, and cities were called after him, and Merle became a favourite name for children of both sexes, and people watched for the next number of the book as they did for the Waverley Novels, or the green monthly Dickens. But the world keeps moving on, and something else is always happening to catch and hold the eyes, and one fears that the great time for this book is over.

It is well written, with the snap and sparkle and lucidity of the French mind, and not a little eloquence and skill. For Mme. Biéler, a daughter of the historian, has inherited a goodly portion of the family gifts. The title is, perhaps, unfortunate—*Une Famille du Refuge* (Marshall, Morgan & Scott; 5s. net). We are frankly informed that it was Galsworthy and his saga that suggested leading up to the main figure through the history of five generations of the family. It makes a stirring tale enough, swiftly put through; but there is only the one striking personality. Notabilities appear and pass across the stage, Napoleon himself no less; and Neander, a dear, impulsive, generous soul in his welter of a study, who lived for his three affections—his God, his books, and his students—and if any one of these last were in financial trouble, would seize a book of value and hurry out and sell it upon his behalf; and Schleiermacher, and Erskine of Linlathen, and Chalmers, with the inevitable verdict once again repeated, the greatest of speakers, and better than he was great (though it is added, interestingly enough, that if the British are first on the platform they have no rivals to the French skill in the pulpit), and above all Robert Haldane, who, appearing in Geneva, exercised an odd and very striking influence over the theological students there, who flocked up to his rooms, all except one, who felt a little haughtily about this foreigner with his execrable French; and yet it was an interview with him that convinced D'Aubigné of the facts of sin, and his own sin, and his need of a Saviour. As in the case at Aberdeen of his friend Malan and old Rabbi Duncan in his student days it was one sudden quotation from the Scriptures that effected it. One wonders would it be so now: and also, do our ministers to-day know the Bible as completely and as aptly as their predecessors did?

An impressive ministry at Hamburg, and another at Brussels, where he was asked to undertake the religious education of the king's son and grandson, and then the Chair at Geneva, and the years of terrifying output—eight thousand pages in the history, and five other works of size, and more than fifty smaller ones, besides masses of lesser stuff—and a keen interest in men and in affairs. He had a real hand in the formation of the Red Cross Society, for instance. And always he had more than he could do. 'I used to count the hours, but now I count the seconds,' so he said, and yet, with all his hurrying, his work was left unfinished. At college his professors had some difficulty in restraining his exuberant eloquence. 'Very good,' said one, 'very good indeed: you have put into your work much excellent religious feeling,' and then added softly, 'almost too much of it, perhaps,' while the Practical Training man, seeking to restrain him, gave him only dry and difficult texts with which to work. But he could catch fire over anything, and did. 'Ah, Monsieur Merle,' remonstrated his baffled teacher, 'you are an eagle, and to prevent you flying I have put you in a cage. But you are off, cage and all!'

Amid the chorus of applause over his book, there were certain voices who dared to allege that his over-exuberance was never fully conquered. A charming, enthusiastic soul, he makes the reader feel, in comparison, uncomfortably cool and even cold. Yet always there is just a doubt whether he really felt more deeply than some of the rest of us who have less gift by far in the expression of our feelings.

THE FOURTH GOSPEL.

Dr. Hugo Odeberg, Lecturer in the University of Upsala, is an able and indefatigable worker in the field of sacred exegesis, and the work he does is that rare spade-work among the sources which places the ordinary exegete under an inestimable obligation. We had the pleasure recently of reviewing his '3 Enoch or the Hebrew Book of Enoch,' and now we would direct our readers' attention to his new volume, *The Fourth Gospel* (Almqvist & Wiksell, Uppsala och Stockholm; 10 kroner).

The volume is published in English, and there is little to indicate that English is not the author's native tongue. It purports to be an interpretation of the Fourth Gospel in its relation to contemporaneous religious currents in Palestine and the Hellenistic-Oriental world; and it makes the claim that the present trend of studies in the Fourth Gospel supports Canon Box's suggestion that early Christianity should be viewed in relation not only to Rabbinical theology, but also to the many different religious currents which flowed by the side of Rabbinism. A superficial reading of the utterances of the Fourth Gospel reveals a terminology all but identical with the Rabbinical; but a careful study of the import of the Johannine utterances often puts us in touch with a sphere of ideas wholly removed from the Rabbinical. The result is a transference of the comparative study of the Fourth Gospel from a Hellenistic to an Oriental environment.

The author seeks to support and illustrate these positions by an examination of selected (often lengthy) passages from the first twelve chapters of the Fourth Gospel; in time he hopes to publish (1) a study of John 13–20, (2) an investigation of the narrative portions of John and of the Prologue and Epilogue.

The commentary, which is preceded by an elaborate bibliography, is particularly rich in Mandæan parallels, which are first quoted in the original, and then followed by a translation. Such parallels invest with new significance a discourse like that on the living water or the bread of life, nor do they detract from its spiritual value. On this last point Odeberg deprecates the attitude of Walter Bauer, who seems to associate Johannine ideas and ideas of the Mandæan literature with primitive cult-observances, and thus to reduce them to a low level of religion. There is an issue here which students of comparative religion are almost bound to face. Those who believe in a Divine providence will be inclined to value even the lowest religious beliefs and practices as containing the germ or potentiality of the higher; while those who do not believe in a Divine providence will be inclined to depreciate the higher as having originated in the lower.

While these learned pages contain much that the ordinary student of the Bible will find illuminating and suggestive, their appeal is primarily to those who engage in specialized studies; and they provide a veritable quarry of material for the most part not readily accessible.

ATONEMENT BY NON-RESISTANCE.

Tolstoy was so impressed with the centrality in the teaching of Jesus of the doctrine of non-resistance to evil that he called it 'the doctrine of Jesus.' In his new book, *The Problem of the Cross* (James Clarke; 10s. 6d. net), William E. Wilson, B.D., of the Selly Oak Colleges, Birmingham, finds in the doctrine of non-resistance to evil (not, however, interpreted with Tolstoyan literalism) a clue to the meaning of Christ's death. He rejects the penal and satisfaction theories of the Atonement as not only repugnant to the modern mind, but also as unscriptural. He regards the Cross not so much as a problem (as in the traditional theories of the Atonement) as a revelation—the revelation, namely, of God's love against the background of human sin and selfishness. And he would explain the connexion between the death of Christ and human salvation by affirming that in the process of winning men to God by exhibiting Him as Love, Christ had to carry His love to the extreme of non-resistance. 'For love faced by hatred ready to go to all extremes can conquer only by non-resistance.'

The theory of the Atonement here set forth belongs to the subjective rather than objective type of theories; its reference is manward rather than Godward. But it seeks to distinguish itself from the ordinary subjective or moral influence theories by arguing for the necessity (if only relative) of Christ's death. To show God to men fully, Christ, it is said, had to die on the Cross. And His non-resistance was not weakness, but the greatest spiritual strength. His death on the Cross is not merely a pictorial representation of the suffering love of God, but the decisive battle in God's age-long conflict with human sin.

In pursuit of his thesis, Mr. Wilson offers us a very readable and timely study of the New Testament teaching on the meaning of the Cross. There have been many studies of this subject in recent years on lines similar to those here followed, but this is an unusually full and detailed study. Further, it seeks to show that inflicted punishment is no part of the Divine economy; it is sin that destroys. In this also Mr. Wilson is in line with other recent expositions of Christian teaching, such as are found, for example, in books by Dr. Percy Dearmer and Mr. Brook. For a generation and more the teaching of the New Testament on the punishment of sin has been an offence; we are now being taught that its teaching has been largely misunderstood, and that in any case it is often inconsistent with the mind of Christ.

THE HEBREW UNION COLLEGE ANNUAL.

No one who is interested in Jewish studies can afford to neglect *The Hebrew Union College Annual* (Hebrew Union College, Cincinnati, Ohio). The essay which will appeal to the widest circle of readers is that by Abraham Cronbach on 'Divine Help as a Social Phenomenon,' which receives editorial notice in this number. The other essays are very erudite discussions of specifically Jewish topics. One, entitled מכתבי־יד, by Jacob Moses Toledano, of Tangier, Morocco, is in Hebrew. Four are in German: one on 'Das tannaitische Grenzverzeichniss Palästinas,' by Samuel Klein, of Czecho-Slovakia; one, containing earlier discussions, on 'Traces of the Matriarchate in Jewish Literature,' by Aptowitzer, of Vienna; one on 'Was Nachman Krochmal a Hegelian?' by Simon Rawidowicz, of Berlin; and one an exhaustive study, running to one hundred and twenty pages, of the Teolology of Maimonides, by Diesendruck, of Vienna. Three other essays are of more general interest. One is by Cecil Roth, of London, on 'The Memoirs of a Siennese Jew' (Joseph da Modena, 1625–1633), which is particularly interesting as giving a vivid glimpse into the life of the common people and constituting perhaps 'the first wholly *popular* document of Jewish history which has been as yet discovered.' The text of the memoirs is given in the original Italian and accompanied by an English translation. There is also an essay by R. J. H. Gottheil, of New York, on 'An Unknown Hebrew Version of the Sayings of Æsop,' the very curious Italian text of which is followed by the Hebrew translation. The essay on 'The Jewish Catacombs and Inscriptions of Rome: An Account of their Discovery and Subsequent History,' by H. J. Leon, of the University of Texas, will be of special value to archæologists. From this discussion it appears that six Jewish catacombs, with a total of four hundred and ninety-four Jewish inscriptions, have been found at or near Rome.

Only two Biblical topics are handled. Paul F. Bloomhardt, of Springfield, Ohio, carefully discusses 'The Poems of Haggai,' furnishing in poetical form an English translation which separates later glosses from the text, and adding valuable explanatory and critical notes. The longest essay in the volume, which runs to one hundred and fifty-one pages—it would by itself constitute a fairly large book—is devoted to 'The Book of the Covenant.' In this very learned, acute, and able discussion, Julian Morgenstern argues that the original Book of the Covenant, which he does not regard as a literary unit, constituted the basis of the reformation of Elisha-Jehu-Jonadab in 842 B.C., and that that was in all probability the date of the composition of the 'words' of that book. But perhaps the most valuable part of this important essay is the long discussion of the Ark, in the history of which he distinguishes three periods, which in his own words may be thus summarized: (1) the early period before the composition of the Book of the Covenant, when 'the ark was conceived as leading Israel upon the march . . , and giving it victory over its enemies'; (2) the period when 'it came to be regarded generally as the depository of the record of the laws basic to Yahwe's covenant with Israel'; and (3) the period represented by the later strata of P, when the ark was 'regarded primarily as the throne of Yahwe, upon which, in the holy of holies, He sat permanently enthroned in the midst of Israel.' These three conceptions of the ark and its functions, he shows, go hand in hand with three different stages in the evolution of the conception of Yahwe in Israel.

PROCESS AND REALITY.

Professor Eddington has complained, and not without reason, that in higher mathematics symbols have been multiplied until it has become a serious task to keep them in mind. Professor A. N. Whitehead is a mathematician, and the same criticism might be passed on his *Process and Reality* (Cambridge University Press; 18s. net). Perhaps there is no philosophic writer of to-day whose work receives more serious attention, and it is unfortunate that it should be said of him, not without a degree of truth, that he is 'one of the worst living expositors of philosophy, though he could be one of the best.' He has largely invented his own terminology, and while it is obviously the expression of a profoundly accurate and logical mind, it becomes to the reader a real stumbling-block. The question suggests itself, will the world have patience to learn this terminology? Professor Whitehead would doubtless argue that a new philosophy demands a new terminology. But again the question arises, how can those who do learn it succeed in interpreting the ideas contained in it except through the language of the plain man?

In the present volume, which contains his Gifford Lectures at Edinburgh, 1927–28, Professor Whitehead offers the most complete account which he has yet given of his system of philosophy. It is 'the philosophy of organism,' a system necessitated by the doctrine of relativity and the revolution in physics. 'In the language of physical science, the change from materialism to "organic realism"—as the new outlook may be termed—is the displacement of the notion of static stuff by the notion of fluent energy.' This world is a 'buzzing' world, a world of events. Every entity 'prehends' every other, and the whole universe enters into each event and combines to make it what it is. Along this line, Professor Whitehead argues, the duality of universal and particular, of mind and body is overcome.

Not the least difficult part of his philosophy is his doctrine of God. The place of the Absolute is taken by 'Creativity,' and God is 'the principle of concretion.' 'The nature of God is dipolar.' 'Viewed as primordial, he is the unlimited conceptual realization of the absolute wealth of potentiality. In this aspect, he is not *before* all creation, but *with* all creation.' As primordial he is 'devoid of consciousness.' But 'the consequent nature of God is conscious; and it is the realization of the actual world in the unity of his nature, and through the transformation of his wisdom.' 'He does not create the world, He saves it; or, more accurately, He is the poet of the world, with tender patience leading it by His vision of truth, beauty, and goodness.' Finally, 'His relation to the world can only be expressed in terms of a group of antitheses, whose apparent self-contradiction depends on neglect of the diverse categories of existence.'

Six of these antitheses are given, of which the last two may be quoted. 'It is as true to say that God transcends the world, as that the world transcends God. It is as true to say that God creates the world, as that the world creates God. God and the world are the contrasted opposites in terms of which Creativity achieves its supreme task of transforming disjointed multiplicity, with its diversities in opposition, into concrescent unity, with its diversities in contrast.' It may be safely predicted that interpreters of Whitehead's doctrine of God will reach as diverse conclusions as did the interpreters of Hegel.

INDIAN PHILOSOPHY.

Anything that Professor Radhakrishnan writes has to be read by those with any interest in Indian thinking: and the best thing that he has given us as yet is the first volume of his *Indian Philosophy* (Allen & Unwin; 21s. net). It is a large and serious work, for serious students, though written, not with lucidity alone, but with real charm. And it is a happy symptom that apparently it has caught on. First published in November 1922, the portion on the 'Philosophy of the Upanishads' was reprinted separately in 1924, and now here comes the second edition of the book as a whole. Well, it is little wonder. For the subject is a fascinating one, and wide in range and curiously freshly treated—the Hymns, the Upanishads, the Jains, the Epics, the Bhagavadgita, and Buddhism; and the author has a double right to speak in the possession of a very full and accurate knowledge, and of a first-hand interesting mind. The work has been revised. And the most interesting section of it is the new appendix, in which he replies to the critics of his views on Buddha. Like not a few other modern scholars, he just won't have many things that have for long, and with assurance, been bruited about as axiomatic and the veriest commonplaces, but bluntly denies them out and out. For one thing, he is entirely sceptical of Buddha's atheism; and for another flatly disbelieves even in his agnosticism, holding that he really stood by the old Upanishad view concerning the Absolute, only more logically and consistently; knew that that could not be described in mere empirical terms, and would not try. Moreover, he was certain that his countrymen were losing their way in a thick mist of speculations that led nowhere, and that it is in living life that truth is really found. To the philosopher the Absolute is Truth, and for him the way to it is wisdom: to the religiously inclined it is Eternal Love, and is reached by such spirits through devotion: and to the ethically minded it is Righteousness, and won through service and self-sacrifice. Buddha was of these last, and chose that road; but, thinks our author, of that Absolute he was entirely sure.

Moreover, he challenges the alleged negation of the self; while certainly Nirvana is not mere extinction, and a headlong plunge into Not-Being, like Empedocles into Etna. That at least has surely grown quite clear. But if one wishes to have these and kindred matters worked out for him, not by a Westerner regarding them with an alien's eye, but by a modern Indian, who, to be sure, has broken with his countrymen's traditions upon many things, here is a book to read.

PROFESSOR C. LLOYD MORGAN ON PSYCHOLOGY.

There are various classes of readers that will welcome *Mind at the Crossways*, by the veteran psychologist, Professor C. Lloyd Morgan, D.Sc., LL.D., F.R.S. (Williams & Norgate; 10s. 6d. net). The expert psychologist will find here much to interest him, and particularly the elaborate exposition of the psychological theory of mind-body relationship known as Concomitance. Dr. Morgan comes near a definition of this theory on page 50. 'It implies that this special type of co-relation obtains only within the organism as body-mind; and is that which is symbolized by the hyphen. It means that there is one course of events within the organism; just one—though these events are always in twofold relatedness, physical and mental, diverse in kind yet inseparable, but none the less distinguishable under abstract analysis.' To make this plain is the main object of the book, and to distinguish it from J. B. Watson's view on the one hand, which puts efficient causality in stimulus, and Dr. McDougall's which puts it in mind.

The evolutionist also will read with interest a fresh presentation of the theory known as emergent evolution associated with Dr. Morgan's name and elaborated in his Gifford Lectures.

The philosopher will be interested in his two types of explanation, namely, the scientific and the dramatic, and in Dr. Morgan's justification of the dramatic method if we are to understand reality. Newton 'saw no discrepancy or contradiction in accepting a natural interpretation and accepting also an explanation of the solar system as due to the act of God as supreme agent.'

The theist especially will welcome the unequivocal position of the author. 'If we comprise under the one word "evolution" the whole course of natural events, so too should we comprise in one word an answer to the question: Who does it? The answer to which I am led on philosophical grounds is no new one. It is this. God does it. The whole course of events subsumed under evolution is the expression of God's purpose'—and the volume ends thus: 'But in the language of symbolism God stands at all emergent crossways. All instances of emergent advance are, in dramatic regard, the expression of one Divine purpose.'

Some of those who may find difficulty in agreeing with the psychological arguments of the writer will welcome his unambiguous conclusions.

The Renaissance of Jesus, by Professor George Tolover Tolson (Abingdon Press; $2.00), is largely a polemic against historic Christianity. The writer sharply distinguishes between Christianity and the religion of Jesus. Briefly, his thesis is that from the days of Paul, the founder of Christianity, the Church has lost sight of Jesus, whose face has remained hidden until our time, when it has been rediscovered by the work of modern critics. He concedes, indeed, that 'former unscientific and uncritical generations, who were not ready for the greater revelation, found themselves able to live spiritually, to some degree, by the letter'; but through recent advances in science and the scientific study of the gospel records 'the modern enlightened man' is led 'forward to new levels of Christian living.' In the writer's rapid survey of the Gospels and of Christian history there is a deal of slapdash criticism, with perhaps a keener edge on it than is necessary. This latter feature is doubtless due to the activity in America of the Fundamentalists. What this renaissance of Jesus involves the writer does not precisely say, but one gathers that it consists in the adoption of the ideals of Jesus. The book closes on a characteristic note in which America is summoned 'to undertake her destined place of moral leadership of the world,' and secure the triumph of these ideals.

Is democracy on its trial? And is it justifying itself? Has it any defects? And (if so) are these remediable? There are those who point to the work of Signor Mussolini as a proof that there is a better way than democracy. He has vitalized Italy, and he has done what democratic leaders here apparently cannot do—achieved a workable and sensible solution of the industrial problem by his courts of arbitration. A very different answer is given, however, in *Democracy, its Defects and Advantages*, by Mr. C. Delisle Burns (Allen & Unwin; 8s. 6d. net). This is a thoroughgoing defence of the democratic ideal. Not, indeed, of the democratic reality, for Mr. Burns is not blind to the blots on the page. But he is convinced that the only tolerable and possible form of government is the democratic, and he is just as convinced that its present faults can, and will, be removed. The basis of his argument is the existence of abilities in the common man, and therein he stands on Christian ground. Moreover, he boldly contends that if the ideal is to be reached it must be by means of contributions of thought and action from every member of the community. The book is free from any kind of appeal to sentiment or popular clap-trap. It is soundly and carefully reasoned throughout. The leadership offered at present by both intellectual and spiritual guides of the nation is keenly scrutinized. In particular, the churches come in for severe castigation. But it is all in the interest of betterment, and may be accepted meekly, and with reservations. In any case, this is a book to be read and considered. It may reach the 'common man' through the public libraries, and it will do him nothing but good.

In *Divine Justice* (Blackwell; 3s. 6d. net), the Rev. V. J. K. Brook, M.A., offers a useful study in New Testament teaching, whose aim is to consider how far traditional ideas about Divine 'penalties and rewards' are rightly based upon that teaching. In pursuance of this aim, he examines the various books of the New Testament carefully from a modern critical standpoint, and his exposition of their teaching on the subject under consideration is clear and popular, frank and judicious. He finds that St. Paul's doctrine of the judgment is in essentials the doctrine of Christ Himself, and that practically throughout the Pauline writings, except in the legal sections, God appears, as in the teaching of Christ, as a God of love, not as a Judge. He believes that there will be a judgment, but that it will be the expression not of mere justice, but of the love of God and of Christ—of the Father who spared not His own Son, and of the Son who faced death 'for us men and for our salvation.' A particular point which he would make is that much which is repellent to modern minds in the New Testament teaching concerning the judgment, especially that contained in St. Paul's earlier letters and in Revelation, is due to survival of Jewish ideas.

We have received a copy of the new Scottish Prayer Book, *The Scottish Book of Common Prayer*, as canonically sanctioned for use in the Episcopal Church in Scotland in 1929 (Cambridge University Press). The copy sent, nicely bound in cloth, and beautifully printed in bold clear type, costs 4s. net. It is without hymns, but copies can be had with hymns; and indeed the book is to be had at all prices, from one shilling up to forty-five shillings.

Along with this comes a volume, *The Scottish Prayer Book, its Value and History*, by Principal Perry, D.D., of the Edinburgh Theological College (Cambridge University Press; 4s. 6d. net). In this book Dr. Perry, writing for laymen, explains and justifies the revision which has issued in the publication above mentioned. It is in some senses a new book, but in reality it is simply the old Scottish liturgy, purged of certain defects, and supplied with certain deficiencies. The work has occupied twenty years of careful and devoted labour, and Dr. Perry explains both why a revision was needed and how far this revision has gone.

The chapters on 'The Need of a Scottish Prayer Book' and 'The Sources of the Scottish Prayer Book' are extremely valuable to all who are interested in the subject of Scottish Public Worship, and no one is more capable than Dr. Perry of dealing with this subject in an enlightening fashion. As he himself suggests, the real value of this revision can only be estimated by a prolonged use of the Prayer Book, and it may be sufficient here to note that it has appeared, and that Dr. Perry is a helpful guide to its purpose and contents.

It ought, perhaps, to be added that, in addition to general historical discussions, Dr. Perry gives a detailed exposition of each of the different services.

To commemorate the Tercentenary of A.V. Bible printing at Cambridge, the University Press has issued a charming little booklet, *Three Hundred Years of Printing the Authorized Version of the Holy Bible at Cambridge, 1629–1929*. Cambridge had begun to print the Bible (in the Geneva Version) as early as the year 1588, under the Charter granted to the University by Henry VIII. in 1534. This Charter was confirmed by Charles I. in 1628, and the first Authorized Version printed by the Cambridge University Press was issued in the following year. From that date till the present continuous progress was made, and the story of this is told anonymously in the pamphlet before us. It is quite a romance, and one that reflects great credit on the ancient university. No mention is made of 'The Children's Bible,' issued some years ago, doubtless because this was one of the University's 'Minor Operations,' and was only a partial edition. It deserved mention, however, as a piece of excellent pioneer work and characteristic of the enterprise of this excellent publishing house.

The World-Wide Prayer, by Canon Vernon F. Storr (C.M.S.; 2s. net), consists of 'studies in the missionary aspects of the Lord's Prayer.' It is a very admirable little book. The various petitions of the Prayer are treated in succession, but a specially full exposition is given of the second petition. The whole is introduced by a most helpful chapter on the nature and scope of prayer, while there is an appendix containing 'devotions based on the Lord's Prayer,' which will be found very suggestive.

In a reprint from 'The Jewish Quarterly Review,' Professor Solomon Zeitlin discusses *The Christ Passage in Josephus* (Dropsie College, Philadelphia), with special reference to the Slavonic Josephus. He argues that the so-called Christian passage was not written by Josephus, and indeed that Josephus had no knowledge of the existence of Jesus. He suggests that Eusebius, who first cites the passage, was its author, he being 'the only man who used the word *tribe* in connexion with Christians.' Zeitlin went to Russia to examine all the manuscripts of the Slavonic Josephus to be found there, and he concludes without hesitation that the passage in question is not authentic, as the whole of the Slavonic Josephus is full of Christian interpolations.

In *Phantom Walls* (Hodder & Stoughton; 5s. net), Sir Oliver Lodge has given a restatement of his views on the spirit world and the life to come. 'It is because a beneficent spiritual world has to me become the ultimate reality that I have composed this book.' He writes with his accustomed lucidity, so that the general reader is able to follow him without difficulty. It cannot be said that the book contains any close-knit argument. Rather it is a series of somewhat loosely connected chapters, each dealing with some aspect of the subject. There is much powerful criticism of the mechanistic view of the universe, and a convincing presentation of the invisible realities that underlie phenomena. He touches upon the usual spiritistic evidences of survival, but speaks somewhat slightingly of the resurrection of Jesus. 'So much has been written about the resurrection of the Central Figure of Christianity that it has become almost tiresome.' Sir Oliver does not seem ever to perceive how vastly the unseen world of the medium differs from the bright world of Christian hope.

It will be good news to many that the autobiography of Sir Wilfred Thomason Grenfell—*A Labrador Doctor*—may now be had in a popular edition at the price of 7s. 6d. (Hodder & Stoughton). This is the tenth edition.

An amazingly interesting and helpful book is *How to Read the Bible*, by the Rev. Walter F. Adeney, D.D. (Independent Press; 2s. net). It was originally published thirty years ago, and it is a tribute to Dr. Adeney's sanity of judgment that it is now republished practically without alteration. The only changes are in the list of books for further reading, which naturally had to be brought up to date. The book is divided into two parts. One deals with 'Principles,' and these are sound and modern. The other takes each section of the Bible in turn and applies the principles in detail. It would be impossible to praise this little book too highly. Any one who wishes to understand the Bible, and realize its fascination, its vital force, its real message, could not find a better guide. It would be a blessing if this book, so packed with wisdom, were widely read, marked, and digested.

A plain statement of the ordinary churchman's belief is made in *The Faith of an English Churchman*, by Mr. Albert Mitchell (Longmans; 2s. 6d. net). Every Christian doctrine is dealt with, and the common sense, 'middle' position of the evangelical believer is laid down. There is not anything striking or original in these chapters. The only feature which is notable is that each statement is documented by references to Scripture passages placed in the margin. This does not mean that the writer is fundamentalist. His position is neither High Church nor modernist; nor is it obscurantist. It is that of a sensible, evangelical, open-minded faith, and the book will interest and edify readers of that persuasion.

Dr. Hector Macpherson is well known as a popular writer on astronomy, and he has all the qualities that fit him for the task. He is thoroughly abreast of the subject, he knows how to marshal his facts, and his style is lucid. In *Modern Cosmologies* (Milford; 7s. 6d. net), he gives an historical sketch of researches and theories concerning the structure of the universe. The book consists of eight lectures delivered in the Royal Technical College, Glasgow, during the winter of 1928–29. After a rapid survey of the development of the science from early times to the end of the nineteenth century Dr. Macpherson wisely devotes the major part of his volume to an account of the marvellous advances which have been made in the twentieth century. The book may be warmly commended to all who wish to know in brief outline the latest theories as to the physical structure of the universe.

Many will be glad to have *Christian Ideas in Political History*, by Canon C. E. Osborne, M.A., T.C.D. (Murray; 10s. 6d. net), not only for its own intrinsic excellence, but also as a memorial of Henry Scott Holland. It consists of lectures delivered at Manchester in 1925, under the Holland Memorial Trust.

The writer attempts to trace the influence of Christian ideas on the communal and social side of human existence from the first century down to the present time. Owing to the territory covered, there are errors of distribution and proportion, but of this the author himself is well aware.

We are sure, for example, that most readers, while glad to read what he says about the Policratus of John of Salisbury, will feel that it is treated with a fulness which is due to Canon Osborne's private and national predilection rather than to its historic importance; but in spite of such errors of judgment in the selection of the matter, this volume reads well and is worth reading. We hope it will have a large sale.

It is clear that the writer's chief authorities are Troeltsch and von Hügel—and their influence, with the author's own church point of view, are clear throughout his work and in his historical judgments. We would like a far fuller treatment of the influence of Wesleyanism in England than he gives. From this point of view Wesley was infinitely more important than John Henry, Cardinal Newman.

The section on Augustine is particularly good, and that on Calvin also. There are in the latter evidences of the prejudices against the great Genevan, which Anglicans find it so difficult to overcome—but with Troeltsch's help Canon Osborne has, to an unexpected extent, overcome them.

His summary of modern social movements

suffers from sketchiness—little is said of either Auguste Comte or Karl Marx—but, notwithstanding, this is a fine book, excellent in tone and temper, matter and manner. We hope it will do something to bring together what should never have been separated, the ardour of the social reformer and the regenerative power of the Christian faith.

The Rev. James Robson, M.A., who has been a missionary in Southern Arabia and is now lecturer in Arabic at Glasgow University, has turned his knowledge of Arabic to good account by issuing, in 'The Wisdom of the East' series, a highly interesting little volume on *Christ in Islam* (Murray; 3s. 6d. net). It consists chiefly of sayings attributed to Jesus and stories about Him which are found in the writings of various Muslim writers, beginning with the Ḳorân. Many of the sayings and stories have obviously a New Testament origin, which appears sometimes in a relatively accurate, but frequently in a distorted, form. The sobriety of the New Testament is in healthy contrast to the fantastic tales about speaking skulls, speaking hills, etc., and is especially evident in contrast to the frequent references, sometimes in grotesque connexions, to raisings from the dead. The reiterated emphasis on the importance of asceticism —'The world is a bridge, so pass over it and do not inhabit it'—has, as Mr. Robson aptly points out, stronger support in the words of Jesus than is commonly recognized. Once, on p. 56, he adduces New Testament parallels; similar Scripture references at appropriate points throughout the book would have enhanced its value. Occasional sayings reveal the Muhammadan hostility to the doctrines of the Incarnation and the Trinity. 'To Muhammad Jesus was no more than a prophet, even though He is accorded a dignity which is given to no other.' This quaint little book, with its store of information difficult of access, should find many readers.

We have received from the National Sunday School Union copies of their various publications containing teachers' notes in connexion with the different lesson courses for 1930. These are as follows (with their respective cost): *The Intermediate Concise Guide* (for the Intermediate Graded Course; 3s. 6d. net), *The Concise Guide* (for the Junior Graded, and the International Uniform Courses; 3s. 6d. net), and *The Primary Concise Guide* (for the Beginners' and Primary Lessons; 3s. 6d. net), all edited by the well-known expert, Mr. E. H. Hayes. In addition there are *Notes on the Scripture Lessons* (the British Uniform or 'International' Lessons, the Junior Course of the British Graded Lessons; 3s. 6d. net), edited by Mr. J. E. Feasey, and *Notes on the Morning Lessons* (2s. 6d. net), by the Rev. C. F. Hunter, B.A. It is hardly necessary to do more than chronicle the appearance of these books. They are well known for their admirable qualities. There are lesson-stories, Bible expositions, general talks, pictures, orders of service, and everything is carefully, intelligently, and suitably designed to give the maximum of necessary help to teachers. It would be difficult to be uninteresting with these books in one's hands.

In our May issue for 1924 we reviewed at some length the revised edition of Professor W. Ernest Hocking's *Human Nature and its Remaking*. This edition was not only revised, but contained considerable additions to the former one. We are glad to see that a second printing has now been necessary. The publishers are the Oxford University Press, and the price is 18s. net.

In lieu of the autobiography which Sir Hermann Gollancz was requested to write, he has conceived the novel idea of outlining his career in a volume called *Personalia* (printed for private circulation: Oxford University Press), which takes the form of a succession of certificates, testimonials, congratulatory messages, letters and addresses, reports and presentations, etc., covering his career from 1862, when he received a school prize for general proficiency, to 1928, when he was officially thanked by the Federation of Jewish Relief Organizations for the help he rendered that body in their humanitarian work for Eastern Europe. The epoch-making dates in his life, when testimonials or congratulations were most abundant, naturally receive most prominence, such as his appointment to the Professorship of Hebrew at University College, London, the occasion of his jubilee, and the conferment of his knighthood. The activities represented by this volume, many as they are and eloquently as they testify to Sir Hermann's versatility, do not by any means exhaustively represent his services to the community; and his friends, who will welcome this volume, may therefore still wish to see it supplemented by a further sketch. This is a unique record of a long and honourable life, crowded with eminent services to the causes of religion, learning, and humanity. The value of the volume is enhanced by some interesting illustrations and a full bibliography.

It is not often that one is permitted to read the testimony of Charles Darwin to the 'wonderful' and incredible success of the Christian missionary. This was forthcoming in a speech of the late Archbishop Benson at the annual meeting of the South American Missionary Society in April 1885. From his experience as a young man on board the *Beagle* engaged in scientific exploration, he held the opinion that 'it was utterly useless to send Missionaries to such a set of savages as the natives of Tierra del Fuego, probably the very lowest of the human race.' How this set of savages were actually won over to civilization and Christianity is the wonderful and almost incredible story told in *Bishop Stirling of the Falklands*, by Canon F. C. Macdonald, M.A., O.B.E. (Seeley, Service; 10s. 6d. net). It was in one of the natural harbours of the Falkland Islands off the extreme south of South America that the ships of our fleet awaited and, later, all but annihilated the German cruisers in the South Pacific. But that naval victory notable as it was in the early years of the Great War was as nothing compared with the victory for Christian missions achieved during the last three decades of the nineteenth century by Bishop Stirling, the first Anglican Bishop of South America, with these islands as his headquarters. It was justly said of him, 'If any man deserved the Victoria Cross it was Bishop Stirling, for he carried his life in his hand, and the chances were all against him ever returning to civilization.' He lived for seven months alone with savages. He had several narrow escapes from a violent death at their hands, but he is able to say, 'a dim touch of heaven surprised the heart with joy, and I forgot my loneliness in realizing the privilege of being allowed to stand here in Christ's name.' His earlier career is an extraordinary record of strange adventures and hair-breadth escapes both by sea and land. What an impracticable scheme it seems to build the cathedral church of this vast diocese on one of the Falkland Islands and thence carry on the supervision of mission work in the great provinces of Brazil, the Argentine, Chili, and Peru. But it was not so impracticable as making the Bishop of London the episcopal head of the diocese of South America.

It happens that following the publication of the story of Bishop Stirling, the first Anglican bishop of the huge diocese of South America, we also have a most interesting and indeed remarkable book from his successor, Bishop E. F. Every, D.D., entitled *Twenty-Five Years in South America* (S.P.C.K.; 7s. 6d. net). In this beautifully printed volume there are four most useful maps, in which Great Britain and Ireland are represented on the same scale as the republican States of South America. The contrast in area and in all the great natural features between these vast territories and the tiny British Isles is overwhelming, but in the matter of population and its distribution the contrast is all on our side. Bishop Every describes South America as 'the world's empty continent.' Except round the capital, near the seaboard, both on the Atlantic and the Pacific side, or along the lines of railway, not yet very numerous, or the great navigable rivers—vast waterways—the population is really very scanty, and there is room for enormous development. Brazil is dominated by the Portuguese, Argentine by the Spanish. Roman Catholicism in all its phases may be said to be the dominant religion, but there are Presbyterians, Methodists, Baptists, North American as well as British Episcopalians, and a great variety of other sects. 'Even the masses in the cities who are entirely alienated from the Church react strongly towards spiritualism and such-like cults.' Seven years after Bishop Every succeeded Bishop Stirling, the original diocese of the Falkland Islands—the only British territory in that region—embracing as it did almost the whole of the South American States, was subdivided, and he became the Bishop of Argentine and Eastern South America, with his Cathedral Church in Buenos Ayres, the capital of Argentine. He has given us a most vivid narrative of his twenty-five years' experience. He has travelled widely not only throughout the vast areas of the Eastern States, but also in the Pacific Coast States of Chili and Peru. He has been behind the scenes a good deal wherever he has journeyed, and this includes the far-flung region from the Amazon in the North to the Straits of Magellan in the South. There is not a superfluous chapter nor a dull page in the volume.

A book like *Magic and Grace*, by the Rev. Lindsay Dewar, B.D., Vicar of Witton (S.P.C.K.; 6s. net), is very difficult to estimate justly. The writer's declared object is to 'keep open the door for faith in the beliefs of the historic Church.' He has in mind specially, we imagine, those who have been captured by the 'new psychology,' and his aim is largely to state Christian beliefs in the terms of that interesting science. Thus, our Lord's temptations arose from a conflict of instincts, and in the three temptations we see the religious instinct sublimating one or other of the other instincts (hunger, self-assertion, fear). Again, what happened to the disciples at Pentecost was that they received power through the integration of their personalities. The sudden breaking down of certain repressed instincts led to the speaking with tongues. This sort of thing will fatigue some readers, and perhaps infuriate others. But it will interest, and perhaps help, still others. In any case, this book is an able performance, and, even if the writer's conception of grace proves unacceptable, any one who pursues the argument sympathetically will find much in it that is suggestive. The book is well worth reading.

Perhaps the Lord Christ has no worthier representative in India than Dr. Nicol Macnicol. The man's own spirituality and intimacy with the Master, the fullness of his understanding of the Indian mind, and his quickness and depth of sympathy with it, make him an invaluable link between it and our Lord.

Something of all that is present in a little book, originally issued in India, and now reproduced here, *What Jesus means for Men* (S.C.M.; 3s. net), in which one by one he takes the names that have been given the Master—Jesus, the Christ, the Lord, the Son of Man, the Son, the Logos, the Redeemer, the Name that is above every name—and works out their implications, and the promise and the blessed facts that lie in them. It is a moving little book, scholarly, entirely simple, with not a few apt references to, or quotations from, the heart and brain of India, and very winsome because welling up out of a deep affection.

It should suggest a set of really helpful sermons.

The University of Chicago has sent out many books of a practical kind on religious education that are of great value. Indeed, the best work of the kind that reaches us from America comes from this enterprising and intelligently inspired press. The latest publication of the kind is of an unusual nature. Its general title is *The Christian Way*, a Teacher's Manual, and the writer is J. Marie Leberman. The Manual puts all sorts of questions of interest to children (questions that are designed to cover Christian conduct), such as, 'How shall we act at a Church Picnic?' Each question is the basis of a lesson on 'Project' lines. The teacher is carefully guided through the teaching process; suggestive questions are provided, pictures are given, note-book work indicated, dramatization and practice and other adjuncts described. But the Manual is not all. There is another book, this time for the pupil, *My Book on the Christian Way*. It is a beautiful book, of quarto size, with loose leaves. Many pages are blank, except for a heading, such as, 'What I should like to know,' or, 'Drawings and Pictures' (to be done by the child). Other pages have songs with music. Others, again, have 'A Story for the Christian Way.' The two books are meant to be used together. The cost is 5s. 9d. and 3s. 6d. net each, and they can be got from the Cambridge University Press in this country. They are altogether delightful, and any Primary Teacher will rejoice in them and find them a godsend.

The Walter Seton Memorial and the First Walter Seton Memorial Lecture (University of London Press; 2s. net) is the title of a pamphlet which will interest many besides the friends and admirers of the late Secretary of University College, London. The Memorial Lecture is from the pen of Mr. Harold E. Goad, O.B.E., M.A., director of the British Institute at Florence, and treats of 'The Fame of St. Francis of Assisi,' which Walter Seton by his scholarly books and patient researches did something to enhance. The two wings of Fame as she flies around the world are here described as Romance and Challenge, and under the guidance of these two ideas an eloquent and learned tribute is paid to St. Francis. A valuable part of the Lecture is its account of the revival in the last half-century of general interest in St. Francis's life and teaching.

Under the influence of Kant and Ritschl the old arguments for God seemed to have disappeared, and as fashion prevails in philosophy and in theology as well as in other departments, students were afraid of saying anything to the contrary lest they should be considered obscurantist.

The tide is turning, and *The Reality of the Idea of God*, by W. Tudor Jones, M.A., Ph.D. (Williams & Norgate; 6s. net), is an attempt to put the argument for God in modern form from the standpoint of a chastened idealism. While the author is basally at one with the Hegelian or idealistic view, he takes a wider sweep and gives place to the non-rational and the supra-rational nature of man as well as to mysticism. He finds God along all the avenues of our experience. The book makes difficult reading, but it well repays perusal, although we would welcome an illustration or two to relieve the cold sublimity of the author's thought.

There is a practical aim running through the volume, for Dr. Jones feels that the very fate of society depends on the right view of God. 'Nothing but the universal, unseen, spiritual realities of life can save the world.'

His references to Christianity are meagre and obscure. 'In the western world at least, the uniqueness of the personality and works of the Founder of Christianity can never be transformed into anything other than what it is in its original essence and as incarnated in the individual life of a particular person.'

That seems clear, but then he goes on: 'Views concerning any Founder of religion must not be allowed to prevail when they come into direct conflict with views of life and the universe which have proved themselves untrue.' This is too vague to be of any help, and this vagueness pervades the volume, so that we never feel sure what exactly the author himself has behind his general statements, nor can the reader easily put concreteness into his sentences. The book is interesting and comprehensive, but elusive.

The Mind of Christ on Moral Problems of To-day.

II.

The Moral Aspects of Gambling.

By the Reverend Peter Green, M.A., Canon of Manchester, Chaplain to H.M. the King.

The present Chancellor of the Exchequer has described gambling as 'the distinctive vice of our age,' and there can be little doubt that he is right. There are many causes at work to produce this result. The wide defusion of education, the extended hours of leisure, and the increased and daily increasing opportunities for amusement, all tend to produce in the minds of many people the belief that wealth, material wealth, is the supreme good. If we add to this the way in which the wealth of the more richly endowed classes is daily flaunted before the eyes of the workers, and daily described for their envy in the press, we need not wonder that the desire to grow rich, and the desire to grow rich quickly and without too much effort or delay, is the ruling passion of many minds. The late C. F. G. Masterman, a thoughtful and acute observer of national life and character, used to say that much of the popular unrest and discontent among the poorer classes was due to the motor-car which brought the manners, clothes, and lives of the idle rich prominently before the eyes of the workers. All this, working in combination with the lowered moral standards which the war has produced, has led to a really fearful growth of the gambling spirit in post-war England.

And this evil spirit in our people is industriously cultivated and exploited by a very large portion of the popular press. It is impossible to walk down a street in the poorer part of any big town to-day without seeing, outside every small newsagent's shop, ten or more placards, four out of five of which bear some such legend as 'Thousand Pounds must be won,' 'Local Reader wins £500 Prize,' 'We gave Rosy Dawn, 30 to 1.' The newspaper placards which refer to any topic in which it is possible for a man of sense to take any rational interest will be outnumbered by four to one by those which appeal only to the desire to get something for nothing.

Nor can it be denied that the effect of the action, on the part of the late Government, of licensing gambling was exactly what all the experts on the subject prophesied that it would be. When the bookmaker's coupon bore a Government stamp it was inevitable that young people of both sexes (and, for that matter, people no longer young as well) should come to regard gambling as a legitimate amusement which might reasonably find a place in every life. Nor did the sudden leap into popular favour of Dog Racing, even while it shocked the more thoughtful members of the community, fail to play its part in spreading the moral infection.

Now, if we desire to combat this growing vice, the first step is to establish the essential immorality of gambling in every form. For there are few commoner, and no sillier, phrases than the one which says that you cannot cure great social evils by pious talk, and that preaching is no use in the practical affairs of life. If by 'pious talk' and 'preaching' mere aimless invective is meant there may be some truth in the statements quoted. But if efforts to educate the public mind, and to create a healthy public opinion, are meant, we may safely say that great social evils are never cured, nor the practical affairs of life improved, by any other means. Before the slave could be set free the early abolitionists had to create a public opinion against negro slavery. Before the disgusting and shameless drunkenness of the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries could be replaced by cleaner and healthier manners, the early temperance reformers had to preach, alike by word and by example, the obligation of higher standards. And so it will be with gambling. It is not likely that this, any more than any other vice to which frail human nature is liable, will ever be wholly eradicated. There is no reason why an immense improvement should not be effected. But that improvement will be effected, if effected at all, only when a better public opinion on the whole subject has been aroused. And it is to that task that the Christian Church must address itself with all its power. For it is scarcely too much to say that there is no public opinion against gambling to-day. There are a few individuals who are prepared to stand out boldly and denounce all gambling as essentially sinful. But they are regarded as cranks. The ordinary man, even the ordinary church-member, takes it for granted that 'There's no moral harm in a little betting,' and that, provided that a man knows when to stop, he has a right to do what he likes with his own money. Let the reader raise the question, in mixed society, and it is safe to prophesy that some one will say, before the matter has been under discussion for five minutes, 'Well, I know, of course, that gambling does a lot of harm—but I can't see that it is wrong in itself.'

Now it is exactly this that we must endeavour to prove. We must seek to show that gambling is essentially immoral under all circumstances. The *amount* of moral evil will, of course, vary in different cases, and may in some cases be very small. And the moral guilt of the person gambling will also vary, and if the gambler is acting ignorantly that guilt may be, as we shall see, almost nil. But for all that, gambling is essentially immoral in all cases. Now if we are to prove this we must clearly have some clear-cut definition of gambling. Here it is:

> A gamble is a transaction between two parties, whereby the transfer of something of value is made wholly dependent on chance *in such a way that the whole gain of one party is the whole loss of the other.*

The latter part of this definition has been printed in italics because it is the most important part of the whole definition, and brings out clearly the real nature of a gamble. In a true gamble *there is no increase of wealth.* Hence, anything that one man gains, some other man must lose. In genuine business that is not so. If I buy a pound of tea I get what I want without having the trouble of going all the way to Ceylon to fetch it; my grocer, and all the other people engaged in the trade, get remuneration for the part they have taken in bringing it to me. All benefit. But wealth need not necessarily be material wealth. Economists count *services* as wealth. So when I take a taxi the driver benefits by the money I pay him; I benefit by the service he renders me. Only in gambles can it be said that all the gain is on one side and all the loss on the other, and that there is no increase of wealth for the community at large.

Many people suppose that the nature of a gamble consists in the fact that chance is involved. But there is chance in everything in life. If the presence of chance in any transaction made it a gamble the really idiotic contention of a prominent Member of Parliament that 'all life is a gamble; business is a gamble, marriage is a gamble' would be true. But, as we have seen, the true characteristic of a gamble lies in this that there is no increase of wealth possible, so that the community does not benefit in any way, but the entire gain of one party is the loss of the other party. A commercial venture may be in the highest degree speculative, and yet not be a true gamble. For instance, a company might be formed to extract radium from sea-water. It would be an extremely hazardous venture, and any one taking shares would run a very good chance of losing all he put into it. But if it proved successful there would be increase of wealth. The community would benefit by increased supplies of radium. The shareholders would get dividends. It is most important that people should realize the distinction between a true gamble and a merely risky and hazardous venture. For when a distinguished economist said some years ago that the gambling spirit was essential to industry and had made England what she is, he had in mind, undoubtedly, the spirit that is prepared to take risks and to make dangerous experiments. He had not in mind the spirit that tries to get something for nothing, and that leads a man to waste time and energy on that which can add nothing to the general well-being of the community.

Now that we have clearly defined the nature of a gamble we can proceed with our task of showing that gambling is in all cases, and under all circumstances, immoral.

We must first glance briefly at the economic and social effects of gambling. For morality is no 'chimera bounding about in a vacuum,' and it is impossible to decide the moral nature of an action without some knowledge of its practical effects. Indeed, those people who say that they recognize, of course, that gambling does an immense amount of harm, but that they cannot see it is wrong in itself, surely stand condemned. If man is, as Aristotle says, a 'social being,' how can that which does an immense amount of harm fail to be 'wrong in itself'? People often confuse the issue by comparing gambling with 'drinking.' The answer, of course, is that the comparison cannot be made till they say what they mean by 'drinking.' If they mean the consumption of alcoholic drink in moderation, then the statement that it does an immense amount of harm is one that many people do not accept. If they mean getting intoxicated, then it is most certainly wrong in itself. But leaving such utterly unconvincing comparisons alone let us look at the social and economic effects of gambling in England to-day.

i. *At a time when the nation is staggering under a load of debt and of unemployment it lowers the output of wealth by at least twenty per cent. per annum.* Many years ago a prominent Manchester manufacturer told me that, in his opinion, it would benefit the head of any big business to pay ten per cent. annually on his capital, if by that means he could stop all gambling, as the loss due to bad work, spoilt material, wasted time, and friction in the workshop caused by gambling cost twice that. I have an immense stack of evidence, collected during the last fifteen years, which thoroughly bears out that statement.

ii. *It imposes a crushing load on the whole trading community.* Here is a typical case. A woman whom I have known for the last five-and-twenty years, and whom I can trust, keeps a small draper's shop. She told me recently that she and her husband had £300 owing to them by three women customers, who had had goods for 'nick-nack' clubs. The women had sold the goods, spent the money gambling, and now could not pay. The husband, the previous Friday, had got eighteenpence from the three when he went round trying to collect something off his debt. If a small shop refuses credit the customers go off to the big ready-money stores down town. If they give credit they see the money that should come to them go to the bookmaker. How many small shopkeepers are driven into bankruptcy every year in this way? Here, again, I have enough evidence to fill a good-sized volume. But it will be more convincing if the reader will try to collect evidence, from his own neighbourhood, for himself.

iii. *It is the chief cause that brings men and women, boys and girls, into the dock as criminals.* When Detective-Inspector Thompson of Scotland Yard made that statement before the Commission of 1923, he was asked on what evidence he based it. He replied: 'More prisoners attribute their fall to that than to any other cause.' Here, again, the difficulty, if I tried to quote examples, would be to select one or two from the number at my disposal. One example will do. A large wholesale house in Lancashire had twenty-four cases of theft or embezzlement between January 1920 and May 1923; in twenty-three cases careful investigation showed that gambling was at the root of the matter. In the twenty-fourth case gambling was suspected, but the man denied it.

iv. *It is, beyond even drink, itself the chief cause of poverty, suffering among children, and trouble between married people.* Here is a story, of no special evidential value as to the prevalence of betting among women, but worth quoting for its own sake. I was talking to a woman who had asked me for relief, and was telling her that I had no inclination to help her while she was betting. When she denied doing so I said, 'I wonder what good you think there is in telling those lies to me when every boy that sells the "One o'clock" (*i.e.* the special sporting edition of the evening paper, published each race day at 10 a.m.) in this district is a member of my ragged school class?' Instantly the woman flushed up, and said angrily, 'What has that boy Norman been saying about me?' 'Oh! it's Norman, is it!' I said, 'whom we get our *One o'clock* from?' No one had told me anything, but the signs of gambling were altogether too obvious to be missed. And those signs can be seen daily in any number of poverty-stricken houses. As one poor woman said to a lady worker recently, 'Wages and all are so bad one has to do something to make a bit extra.' And the delusion that it is possible to 'spoil the bookie,' and to make money by betting, simply leads them deeper and deeper into the mire.

v. *Gambling corrupts every sport it touches.* There is no form of professional sport that is not honey-combed with corruption due to gambling. It is not to the interests of professional journalists to talk on this subject. But if the reader can get an experienced journalist, whom he knows personally, to speak freely he will be amazed at what he will hear. Here, as in other cases, I will content myself with one piece of evidence. I was lecturing in a north-country town on 'Sport and Gambling,' and after I had talked for more than an hour a man came up to speak to me, whom I recognized as a member of the Council of the Football Association. I asked him if he had any complaints to make. His reply was, 'Yes, one bad one. You did not say half enough. In the forty years that I have followed professional sport I have seen it corrupt every sport it touches.'

vi. *Gambling feeds the ranks of professional criminals.* There is probably no source from which the ranks of professional criminals is so steadily recruited as from the lads who begin in boyhood to sell the racing specials issued, as explained above, every race day by evening newspapers. The thirty or five-and-thirty shillings a week which a lad can make selling these papers is big money for a boy. It is too little for a married man, and so the lads, thrust out of the ranks of paper-sellers as they grow up, go to swell the ranks of professional criminals. The police look among the riff-raff which hangs round our racecourses whenever they want to make an arrest. And the violence of the racecourse gangs, such as the notorious 'Italian' gang and its chief rival the 'Birmingham' gang has greatly increased since the war.

vii. *Gambling is the cause of much corruption among the police.* This is a very grave charge to make, and I should not make it lightly. But recent revelations in the press have but confirmed statements that I made in print five years ago and more. Here, again, one piece of evidence will be enough. I attended a private conference of clergy and social workers, held under the chairmanship of the Mayor, in a small Lancashire cotton town. At the end of my speech the Mayor said, 'I am far from denying the truth of what the speaker has said. Such things have happened in this town in the past, and may even be happening to-day. The matter is one of constant anxiety to me and the Chief Constable.'

When we consider these facts (and they are facts that any one can verify for himself, and in his own neighbourhood, with a little trouble) the need for rousing a strong public opinion against gambling in every form must be apparent. The difficulty is that few people have any clear idea of what they mean by 'right' and 'wrong.' Most people can say what they believe to be right, and what they believe to be wrong. It is when they seek to say why this is right and that wrong that they fall into difficulties. They have, that is to say, no clearly defined basis of ethics. But most people would admit that we have a fourfold duty—to God, to our own souls, to our neighbour, and to the whole of society. Clearly, gambling transgresses each of these. Let us consider each of these in turn.

(*a*) *Our duty to God.* God has given us time, money, abilities, and opportunity that we may use these things in His service and the service of our fellow-men. To use them in the endeavour to get something from another person without giving anything in return is to misuse them. It makes the matter no better that he is engaged in the same endeavour to get something for nothing from us. Some people argue that this line of reasoning condemns spending time or money or thought on any harmless amusement. But it does not. Harmless amusement, in moderation, is truly *recreation,* that is to say, it recreates our forces for fresh work, and leaves us the better for it. For what kind of useful work does betting refresh and strengthen us? Does gambling do us any good or in any way make us better men?

(*b*) *Our duty to our own characters.* There are few things which so harden and brutalize a man as gambling. The lust for gain, daily fostered and fed, is as powerful as any other lust, say that of hatred or of sensual enjoyment. And it makes men and women incredibly cruel and selfish. Look at the faces of the habitual frequenters of the gaming rooms at Monte Carlo and see what story they tell.

(*c*) *Our duty to our neighbour.* It would seem hardly worth while discussing this aspect of the matter. The defence of betting almost always takes the form, 'I have a right to do what I like with my own. I know when to stop.' This defence wholly ignores the effect of one's example on others, and the fact that many people do not know when to stop. Indeed, it is impossible to defend gambling on any lines which include a reasonable regard for one's duty to one's neighbour.

(*d*) *Our duty to society.* A very brief consideration of what gambling effects in every department of national life must establish the fact that it is essentially anti-social. No one denies that it does harm. The only defence ever put up for it is that it does not do *as much* harm as some people say. But directly any one makes a personal examination of the evidence it becomes evident that it does a great deal more harm than can be expressed in words. Nothing but a careless disregard of social duty can enable a man to defend gambling at all.

Some people hesitate to call gambling sinful because a number of people whom they like and respect gamble with little or no sense of doing what is wrong. This is, of course, no real argument that gambling is not sinful. Sir Thomas More seems to have seen no harm in political assassination.

The Duke of Wellington fought a duel. Mr. Gladstone, when a young man, defended negro slavery. Many excellent people to-day see nothing wrong in war. The moral progress of the race depends on our willingness to recognize that what many excellent people defend may yet be morally indefensible.

The immorality of all gambling may be established along other lines. This has been clearly done by the chaplain of a gaol in the midlands. His argument runs as follows. There are three reasons why I may receive a pound from any one. The first is that I have done a pound's worth of work for him. This is the *Law of Labour*. The second is that I have given him a pound's worth of some commodity. This is the *Law of Exchange*. The third is that he loves me. This is the *Law of Love*. Nothing else can justify me in taking a pound from my neighbour.

When every other defence for gambling has been exposed and defeated, people fall back on the question, 'What about gambling on the Stock Exchange?' To which we may reply, 'Well, what about it?' The question of gambling in business is, of course, enormously difficult. Much that uninstructed sentimentalists condemn as gambling is perfectly legitimate business. On the other hand, there is undoubtedly a great deal of gambling in business, both in stocks and in commodities, and it does an incalculable amount of harm to legitimate business. In the recent 'slump' on the American Stock Exchange it is estimated that one thousand eight hundred million pounds was lost. Much of this, of course, was merely fictitious wealth, the result of previous inflation. But that does not alter the fact that *some one* lost that amount, and legitimate business suffered severely. Indeed, when we seek to create a healthy public opinion about gambling it is well to remember that there is a great deal of gambling in business, that it does infinite harm, and that no legislation will avail to stop it till there is a better public opinion on the whole question.

Some people maintain that insurance is a form of gambling. Certainly there are people who insure where they have no insurable interest, and this is a particularly silly and dangerous form of gambling. But of ordinary business insurance, whether life insurance, fire insurance, or insurance against special business risks, we can say that it is the exact opposite of gambling. Gambling seeks to exploit chance and to concentrate the effect of exceptional luck on a single individual. Insurance seeks to eliminate luck as far as possible, and to distribute the effects of unavoidable good or bad luck as widely and as evenly as possible. So that so far from being a form of gambling, insurance is its exact opposite.

In conclusion, I would say that the first duty of the churches is to keep their own hands clean in this matter, and by avoiding all raffles, ballots, and guessing competitions at bazaars to 'avoid all appearance of evil.'

Pagan Evangelism in the First Two Centuries.

By the Reverend John A. Irvine, B.A., Aberdeen.

The first two centuries, more strictly the period from Nero to Marcus Aurelius, possess features of very rich and varied interest which no single description will cover. Perhaps of no period is it more difficult to come to any general judgment which some incident, cropping up from an unexpected quarter, would not promptly contradict. Let me give one or two references to the moral state of the Empire that may prepare the way for the main subject of this paper.

Dr. Dill, in *Roman Society from Nero to Marcus Aurelius*, says: 'Stoicism's main business as conceived by men like Seneca is to save souls from the universal shipwreck of character. . . . This wreck of character was most glaringly seen among the men who were in close contact with the half-insane masters of the world in the first century.' The moral condition of that period has always seemed so appalling that some explanation such as that hinted at here needs to be assumed. With the rapid growth of the Empire, the establishment of the Pax Romana and the ever-extending means of communication, trade increased by leaps and bounds, and the wealth of Rome reached a height undreamed of in the sturdy, simple days of the Republic. Out of this sprang a luxury and a sensuality in high quarters, well-nigh inconceivable, even amongst the wealthiest of the new rich to-day, and, coupled with this strain in its rulers, produced that moral degradation and decay which so alarmed the better minds in the community.

Though the helm of the State fell into wiser hands with the Flavian emperors and their successors, yet to a moral teacher like Dion Chrysostom 'in spite of all its splendour and outward prosperity, society in the reign of Trajan seemed to be in a perilous state.' Of course men like Seneca and Epictetus and Marcus Aurelius, concerned as they were about the moral conditions around them, would be likely, as we all are, to lay stress upon the more ominous and menacing features of the age.

Even in the days of the Antonines, and in spite of them, the tendency towards a materialism that was to be the ultimate ruin of Rome was becoming more and more apparent. Dion draws in one of his orations a depressing picture of Alexandria, the second city of the Empire, the people sensual and pleasure-loving, filthy in their minds, excited beyond all bounds by the races of the circus and the songs and plays of the theatre. Prosperity helped to increase their entire lack of self-control and to urge them on to the mere animal satisfaction of their passions. The old Paganism of Rome which could be described with so much charm, as Walter Pater does in *Marius*, yet brought along with its ancient pieties much that only debased and degraded. Even Marcus Aurelius says of the people of his time that 'faith and reverence and justice and truth have betaken themselves to Olympus from the broad ways of earth.'

That is the one side. But no sooner has one stated it than there rise up other facts to confront us. 'It was an age ennobled,' says Dr. Dill, 'by a powerful protest against worldliness'; and again, 'By the second century the scepticism of the Neronian age had almost disappeared.' The very disasters, the pathetic longing for a cleaner and nobler life that breaks through from many a soul, had taught men their own insufficiency, and the pride with which they had faced moral tasks was changing into a humbler sense of their powerlessness. Religion became less a matter of the intellect, more a matter of the heart. The need for God became the need not for 'a God to explain the universe, but to resolve the enigma of their own lives.'

It was into this needy world that the new pagan evangelism came; and, as we read its story, we feel that the breath of revival is over the land, and that incurable hunger of the soul for God is driving men in their thousands to listen to the only word of life that most of them had any chance of hearing.

The methods which the representatives of this revival movement employed were just those with which all such movements make us familiar, and the characteristics are those that reveal themselves in all ages. There were the great preachers, men like Dion, Apollonius, Maximus of Tyre, Demonax of Athens, Peregrinus, and the smaller men, unnamed and unknown, of the Cynics, who poured out into the streets and lanes of the cities like the friars in later ages to feed those hungry sheep. They had their conversions, like that of the youth who burst into the lecture hall where one of them was speaking on temperance, and whose drunken mood was sobered, until in the end he forsook his wine-cups. They produced men who dared to rebuke emperors for their sins or their follies, as one of them did, who dealt with Titus to his face as he sat in the theatre with Berenice beside him; or men like Musonius, who in one of the struggles of some civil war threw himself among the soldiers and pleaded for peace.

Of course they had their shadier types, men who were rude for the sake of being rude, and who sometimes slipped readily enough into the habits they themselves were protesting against; men who loved notoriety and lived upon the flattery and worship of their admirers.

Here is a picture. 'After the discourse the professor would go round, "What did you think of me to-day?" says one in Epictetus. "Upon my life, sir, I thought you were admirable." "What did you think of my best passage?" "Which was that?" "Where I described Pan and the Nymphs." "Oh, it was excessively well done."' Or again, from Epictetus: '"A much larger audience to-day, I think." "Yes, much larger." "Five hundred, I should guess." "Oh, nonsense, it could not have been less than a thousand." "Why, that is more than Dio ever had. I wonder why it was: they appreciated what I said too." "Beauty, sir, can move even a stone."'

Dion Chrysostom was born of good family in Bithynia, and was trained as a rhetorician. Banished by Domitian, he wandered through many lands and among wild tribes until the news of the jealous Emperor's death reached him on the Danube and drew him back to Rome, where he became a friend of Nerva and Trajan. But his exile had brought him to a more serious view of life, and he dedicated his gifts to the task, which he now felt to be his mission, of preaching to the many troubled and anxious souls who sought for guidance and spiritual help. He warned his hearers of the fate that would surely come upon a soulless civilization, by pointing to the banished empires of the past whose ruins were amongst them. Into the ordinary city life he strove to bring truer and nobler ideals of brotherhood and service, for salvation was to him no selfish personal concern, but a change that penetrated all a man's activities.

His audiences were gathered sometimes from communities on the very edge of the civilized world, and once he spoke from the steps of the temple of Zeus to the terrified citizens of a half-ruined Greek town that had been raided the day before by Scythians, and to these poor mean-spirited individuals held up the ideal of true citizenship. Prosperous and brilliant though the Greek life of settled provinces might be, Dion was everywhere confronted with strife and jealousy and discord; and his call must often have fallen on deaf ears, and the seed on unpromising soil. Yet the message of renunciation as the true way to freedom, the appeal to see things as they are and to reach a sense of the true values, rang forth from him clearly to the thousands that gathered to hear him.

Of Apollonius of Tyana, the Pythagorean missionary of the time of Domitian, it has been said that he was 'a great preacher. He addressed vast crowds from the temple steps at Ephesus or Olympia rebuking their luxury and effeminacy, their feuds and mean civic ambition, their love of frivolous sports or the bloody strife of the arena. Next to the knowledge of God, he preached the importance of self-knowledge, and of lending an attentive ear to the voice of conscience. He crowned his life by asserting fearlessly the cause of righteousness in the awful presence chamber of Domitian.'

A point of contact between Christian teaching and Cynic meets us in the strange story of Peregrinus—fanatic or impostor, who shall say? Neither Lucian, the merciless critic of all seeming self-advertisement or imposture, nor the Christian writers of the time were quite fitted to judge of this strange career.

Born on the Propontis, and succeeding to a considerable inheritance from his father, which he afterwards surrendered, Peregrinus joined, during his wanderings in Palestine, a Christian brotherhood, and obtained such a position of influence among his followers that he was thrown into prison for a time. Unstable in temper, he came under Eastern ascetic influence, and finally passed back to the Cynics. Through many lands he made his way preaching and teaching, winning extraordinary devotion and affection from his worshippers, not sparing the rich and the powerful in his denunciations of their worldliness. At length, leaping into the blaze of his own pyre, he flung himself away before the multitude gathered at Olympia, so that by his death he might crown the teaching of a life in which the things of sense, and death itself, were treated with contempt.

Another apostle of the revival in Paganism, who drew on him the jealous suspicions of Nero, was Musonius, a searching preacher, according to Epictetus, and a true minister of souls. Setting before men the beauty of goodness and catching glimpses of a goodness higher and nobler than the moral standards of his day had attained to, he sought by appealing to the germ of good in all men to win them to this higher way.

That men with such messages and so much that was definitely monotheistic in their creed should not have thrown overboard the whole confused tangle of heathen idolatry often surprises us. Doubtless all this was a preparation for the Christian message, when the day of its acceptance by the more cultured classes was to come; but the explanation offered by men who felt the inconsistency, as Dion, and Maximus of Tyre did, was the perennial one, that few men can rise to the high abstract ideas of the spiritual, and need the helps and aids which images and ritual and myth might furnish.

Never was this defence expressed more worthily than in a noble passage from the orations of Dion Chrysostom. He is putting into the mouth of Pheidias a defence of his Olympian Zeus, one of the greatest works of antiquity. I quote from Dr. Dill's summary of the argument:

> 'Pheidias pleads in his defence that the artist could not, if he would, desert the ancient religious tradition which was consecrated in popular imagination by the romance of poetry; that is fixed for ever. Granted that the Divine nature is far removed from us and far beyond our ken, yet, as little children separated from their parents feel a strong yearning for them and stretch out their hands vainly in their dreams, so the race of man, from love and kindred, longs ever to draw nigh to the unseen God by prayer and sacrifice and visible symbol.
>
> 'The ruder races will image their god in trees or shapeless stones, or may seek a strange symbol in some of the lower forms of animal life. The higher may find sublime expression of His essence in the sun and starry spheres. For the pure and infinite mind,

which has engendered and which sustains the universe of life, no sculptor or painter of Hellas has ever found or can find full and adequate expression. Hence men take refuge in the vehicle and receptacle of the noblest spirit known to them, the form of man. And the Infinite spirit of which the human is an effluence may perhaps best be embodied in the form of His child.' 'Whosoever,' says Dion, 'among mortal men is most utterly toil-worn in spirit, having drunk the cup of many sorrows and calamities, when he stands before this image, methinks, must utterly forget all the terrors and woes of this mortal life' (Oration XII. 51).

What were the main points in the message of these men? I have kept off the much-debated subject of the Mystery religions, because, for one thing, my point is chiefly the preaching of men whose personal earnestness and use of what we should call the pulpit marked this particular period with much the same urgency of appeal, of conviction of sin, of hope and vision that were present in the Christian teachers who alongside of them were slowly permeating the Empire with the gospel of Christ. One wonders whether the influence of Christian ideas had anything to do with this, whether the walls of partition were wearing thin, and whether even men who seemed, or pretended to be, entirely ignorant of the existence of any such teaching were, unconsciously perhaps, being moved by it.

Yet one must remember that the Mystery religions were pouring in at this time with their doctrine of cleansing from sin and hope of immortality. For it is interesting to note that the scepticism which prevailed at the opening of the first century down to the age of Nero, which was affirmed with cold assurance by Julius Cæsar, and meets us in the grimness with which Lucretius looks for that 'morningless and unawakening sleep' which awaits us when earth's toils are over, gives place at the end of the century to a new wistful yearning that this life may not be all and that beyond life's fitful fever there opens for the earnest soul a higher world.

At bottom the religious heart of humanity is the same. Wherever men come to interrogate life and face its mysteries, they touch the same deep inescapable needs, and what these were, and how close they lie to the great themes with which the Hebrew thinkers and the Christian apostles deal, becomes at once apparent. There was in the preaching of such men as those to whom I have referred the belief that, behind all the strange confusion of life and its perplexing experience, there was a God to whom men might look up, the God of pure and holy thought, whom the legends of popular religion had misrepresented and concealed. For that sense of the loveliness of pure and noble deeds and the unsatisfying nature of any life that missed these was again awakening, springing from that ancient Roman probity, which showed itself so fearlessly in many a simple, austere, virtuous soul; and from those mystical yearnings which, coming at various periods from the brooding East, wakened new desires after an unattained ideal.

Along with this came the message of the pettiness of those earthly and material objects of pursuit, contempt for riches, position, luxury, especially in face of the awfulness of death, 'the great leveller.' Amid the many conflicting forces playing on life nothing was needed so much as a rule of moral light and spiritual guidance so that, amidst the discipline of these, character might be formed and the vices that nobler souls were alive to be met and conquered. It was man's duty then, as one of them put it, 'to wage war with vice day and night and never to relax your guard.'

That the ideal for the ordinary man was not pitched too low we see from the attitude of Dion to such obvious facts as prostitution and slavery. In the words of Dr. Dill: 'The double degradation of humanity which it involved in the ancient world is powerfully painted, and the plea that the indulgence in venal immorality is the only alternative to insidious attacks on family virtue is discussed with singular firmness and yet delicacy of touch. The same detachment from contemporary prejudice is shown in Dion's treatment of slavery. He sees its fell effects on the masters in producing sensuality, languor, and helpless dependence on others for the slightest services.'

That men should sit loose to earthly things was as characteristic a message of these preachers as it was of their brethren in the New Testament Church. That was the only way to peace, only as the soul was set free from all bondage to earthly desires could it be free for the higher life. 'Behold me,' says Epictetus, 'that I am without a city, homeless, poor, without a slave.' This message on the lips of men who practised what they preached went home to many a heart; and, while this quest of spiritual intercourse with the Divine might not be possible for the ordinary mortal, the example of it before their eyes could not have been without consequences in life and conduct.

One wonders whether in those dreams of a spiritual city from which all vice and greed, all cruelty and wrong were banished, and whose citizens were the poor as well as the rich, the bond as well as the free, which Lucian in one of his dialogues attributes to one of his characters, there are any echoes of those writers who were speaking to their humble followers of 'a city that hath foundations, whose builder and maker is God,' and of which another great dreamer was to make such noble use, 'Now just as the gates were opened to let in the men, I looked in after them, and behold the City shone like the sun . . . which when I had seen I wished myself among them.' This makes its appeal to souls through all the ages, for to Pagan and to Puritan alike life brings the reminder that 'here have we no continuing city.'

Now the point that occurs to us naturally, the question that inevitably arises is, how it was that, faced by the same problem, working over the same field, touching the same undying needs of the heart of man, approaching one another so closely at times in thought, that their lives intersect, in the end the final victory lay with these simple folk and not with the pagan evangelists. For on the final issue there can be no dubiety, it was the Galilæan who conquered.

Yet, when one thinks of it and follows the movements of the age, one feels, that all the advantages lay with men like Dion and Maximus. They had the influence of the intellectual and cultured classes on their side, they met with the glad and willing support of all, their message travelled along the familiar roads of thought and religious appeal recognized for ages; every door was open to them; every public place of concourse where they took their stand filled swiftly with eager and obedient listeners. They outraged no sentiment, they bore no foreign aspect, were handicapped by no ignorance nor lack of education, by no suspicion as to their loyalty to the Emperor or the common interests of the Empire, save in special instances where their moral courage voiced the general feeling of criticism of some deed in which decency was overstepped and the conscience of the community defied. For the most part they were welcome in all parts of the Empire, and to men of highest as well as lowest rank. They came with a message, as we have seen, that was lofty and earnest; they lived out the course of life which their preaching commended, and they found a people whom circumstances had made sensitive of a deep spiritual need.

And everywhere in that same Empire, in those same lands around the Mediterranean, there were men of small measure of culture, not many mighty, not many noble, not many wise among them, who, in the end, were victorious where they failed. These Christians came to their task, handicapped by horrid suspicions and cruel libels, deemed enemies of the State, when the State under the menace of the barbarians was feeling her need of unity and unquestioning patriotism. They were hampered by restrictions and denied free access to the opportunities for spreading their faith. Persecution broke into their lives, prison and death dogged their footsteps. Their emphasis upon sin, their proud refusal to have any compromise with the faiths around them, their scorn of them as mere superstitions powerless for good, their unflinching claim of the supremacy of the evangel, the ruthless way in which they broke into the old family loyalties, setting the son against the father, the daughter-in-law against her mother-in-law, all raised the unthinking crowd as well as the philosophic minds against them. Their ethics might be lofty, and many of their tenets bear a close resemblance to those of the popular preachers of Paganism, but their central message of a crucified Jew met with constant ridicule, and might well have seemed fatal to their chances. They lacked the academic training which their rivals enjoyed, they worked in an atmosphere that was hostile, behind them was no worldly influence, and yet in the end the moral reformation was their achievement.

Walter Pater says: 'The central glory of the reign of the Antonines was that society had attained in it, though very imperfectly and for the most part by cumbrous effort of law, many of those ends to which Christianity went straight, with the sufficiency, the success of a direct and appropriate instinct. Pagan Rome, too, had its touching charity sermons on occasions of great public distress: its charity children in long file . . . its prototype, under patronage of Æsculapius, of the modern hospital for the sick. But what Pagan charity was doing tardily, and as if with the painful calculation of old age, the Church was doing, almost without thinking about it with all the liberal enterprise of youth because it was her very being thus to do.' Again, of the games and shows he says: 'Those cruel amusements were certainly the sin of blindness, of deadness and stupidity in the age of Marius; and his light had not failed him regarding it. Yes! what was needed was the heart that would make it impossible to witness all this; and the future would be with the forces that could beget a heart like that.'

Philostratus, the biographer of Apollonius, when the despised faith was beginning to be a formidable rival, endeavoured to show that all that was best in Christ could be found in the pagan religions. 'He had,' says Dr. Rainy, 'exhibited Apollonius

. . . as a reformer and renovator of heathen religion, who exhaled goodness, and who carried the supernatural with him wherever he went. That was in a book, but could it not be done in the face of the world ? '

Yet it was not done. Let us try to discover the reasons. To begin with, Paganism on its highest levels lacked moral depth ; it treated, in a man like Dion, for example, all moral error as an intellectual matter rather than a matter of will. Vice came from a dulled, tainted mind ; and, if only men could be trained to see truth, truth of life and values, all would be well. Thus the appeal of Paganism was to the cultured and the thoughtful mainly. Even men like Epictetus grew bored with the ignorant, the unlettered, the women and children. 'Epictetus,' says Dr. Bigg, 'did not like women and children, because they bored him, and he did not see why he should be bored. These weaker vessels take from the wise man and give nothing in return. They are a clog upon one who pursues inner perfection and tranquillity.' Further, it lacked that intensity of conviction that led men to suffer martyrdom, men and women, old and young, freeborn and slave alike. And it lacked this, because at the centre of it there was set no Cross, that Cross of which Irenæus says : 'In so far as He supports and sustains, He is Stauros, while in so far as He divides and separates, He is Horos' ; so that the Gnostics afterwards called the Cross the boundary, the dividing line.

Still we must be careful lest, in our comparison, we treat the matter even yet, in spite of ourselves on intellectual lines. Nothing to my mind can finally explain the wonder of the Christian triumph but one thing, that the gospel of Christianity, as Paul had put it, was the Power of God unto salvation ; that in the preaching of it, in its high moral tone, in its demand for cross-bearing, in its assurance that life and immortality had been brought to light, in its message of pardon to the most sinful and ignorant, there poured into the souls of men not merely enlightenment, or comfort, but a secret power by which the will was renewed and the wonder of salvation made plain before men's eyes. Paganism in the first century had power to purify the grossest tenets of its ancient mythologies, but not the power on any real scale to change lives.

We see a parallel to this in the religion of India to-day, seeking in the face of the purer Christian message to clear away the grossness that clings to the forms and practices of her ancient faith. There is power to do this, but we have yet to see that Indian religion can do for the rank and file of India, what the gospel of Christianity is slowly but surely effecting.

That Christianity accomplished this in the centuries before Constantine is among the undeniable facts of history. It has been said with an emphasis that will surely not be questioned, as Dr. Cadoux puts it in the close of his exhaustive work on *The Early Church and the World* : 'Make whatever allowance you like for the exaggerations of Christian rhetoric, for actual moral shortcomings of increasing prevalence and gravity, and for the lofty ethical attainments of other reformers and their followers ; and it yet remains true that the achievements of the early Church can defy comparison with those of any other moral or religious movement known to history.'

When one thinks of the force of sexual passion in those days, strong because of the centuries of unchecked freedom, and indifference to self-indulgence, one realizes with what a tremendous moral problem, so deeply entrenched in man's physical nature, the Church was confronted. Nothing can show more the amazing transformation effected by the gospel than to see how Paul's 'such were some of you' became true over a wide area of human life. In spite of constant failures, there arose undeniably a higher ethical view, a cleaner ideal which, while it failed to save the Empire, yet carried, through the fateful years of the invasions and downfall, a healthy tradition that became the guiding principle, the accepted standard, for the new Europe that emerged from the flood and was able to grapple, not all in vain, with those turbulent peoples.

Even in the matter of earthly values, Christianity made a clear and definite protest against the rush for power, the greed of gain and the mad luxury of the time ; it set an ideal of simple, quiet living, an indifference to those aims which men had naturally followed, in spite of the higher voices from their own prophets, and lifted the minds of men to that unseen world whose prizes are to the poor and the meek and the pure in heart. That power of meekness was a discovery the world owed to Christ and His followers. By this the Church sought to teach the age that the inherent conviction of the natural man, coming from immemorial antiquity, that the use of force and retaliation is the only secure way to gain one's ends was false, and that in the long last victory lay with those who endured. Beza's words to the King of Navarre long afterwards were true : 'Sire, it belongs in truth to the Church of God . . . to receive blows and not to give them, but may it please you to remember that it is an anvil that has worn out many hammers.'

That such was really the final result of the travail of the Church in the centuries before Constantine, when she could put no trust in the arm of flesh and her weapons were not carnal but spiritual, is shown by the fact that the apologists continually drew attention to the reality of the Christian life. 'How effective the precepts of God are in the minds of men,' says Lactantius, 'because they are both simple and true, is proved by daily experiences. Give me a man who is easily angered, scurrilous, unrestrained: with a very few of God's words, I will make him as quiet as a sheep. Give me one who is grasping, greedy, close-fisted: I will give him back to thee forthwith generous and distributing his money liberally,' and so on. 'Our people,' he says, 'do nothing but what is equitable and good.' There may be, no doubt, a touch of rhetoric about this, but it is obvious that this claim, upon which they rested so much, was capable of being disproved at once if it were groundless.

I do not know that one needs to qualify this description by pointing out the extravagances and excesses into which the early Church in its zeal ran, overreaching itself in asceticism and neglect of the body. True though this may be, and still truer that, under the fatal gift of Constantine, Christianity became corrupted from her simplicity, yet there has always been a power of recovery unknown to ancient Rome.

My task is finished. I have tried to describe a period fascinating in all the varied movements of thought, in the vision it gives of a return of the tide that had been ebbing from the shores of faith, in a new approach of the spirit of man to God, however faulty and dim, yet driven by that necessity that is ever asserting itself after a sojourn in the far country. Into this movement come these strenuous souls the pagan evangelists, tireless in their energy, impressive in their earnestness, reaching, when at their best, a high level and often approximating closely to that message which their despised contemporaries, the Christian missionaries, were carrying from city to city. Yet in the end it is not they who pass on as the leaders of a religion that was to control and shape the future, but these same humble, persecuted men 'of whom the world was not worthy'; and, when we compare the two and ask why the victory falls at last to those who, judged by ordinary worldly standards, seemed the least likely, there comes only one answer: 'The preaching of the Cross is to them that perish foolishness, but to us who are saved it is the power of God.'

In the Study.

Virginibus Puerisque.

Our Defence is sure.

By the Reverend R. L. A. Tingle, B.Sc., Glasgow.

'Jesus saith . . . have faith in God.'—Mk 11[22].

All you boys and girls have heard about Red Indians. You have read stories about them, and I suppose you have all seen them on the 'Pictures.' Perhaps you think that Red Indians are altogether cruel and have nothing in them but hatred and wickedness. Well, what I have to tell will show you that Red Indians, like all other kinds of people, have good in them too!

When the white man commenced settling in the Red Indian's country of North America, there was much terrible fighting. The white men, you see, settled in the best parts of the land and drove the Red Indians out, and they did not like it.

Amongst the white people were some good folk called 'Quakers,' and they believe that all fighting and killing are wrong, and against the teaching of Jesus. Owing to the fierceness of the Red Indians, the white settlers mostly lived in villages protected from their enemies by high fences or walls. These they called 'forts.' They would go out to their work in the fields all day, and at night they would come back into the forts in order to be protected from the Indians. Even in the daylight, when they went to their work in the fields, they would be sure to have their guns with them. Only so could they feel safe with the fierce Indians prowling about. Now, the Quakers did not live in forts. They built their homes in the open fields where they worked. Neither did the Quakers carry guns with them when they went out to their work. Indeed, they had no guns! They would not buy them! for they believed it was wrong to shoot and kill; and even if they were without guns and in unprotected cottages outside the forts, they believed that God would take care of them.

Two of the Quakers, true to their faith in God, went day after day to their work in the open fields carrying no guns, and they returned safe and sound each evening.[1] They did not know that Indians were round about them in hiding. Time after time the Indians said to each other, 'Let them pass. They are peaceable men and will hurt nobody, for they carry no guns.' But these two Quakers heard of terrible massacres being done by the Indians in other places, and they began to be afraid. They felt so frightened that they secured some guns, and the next morning they started out to work armed with their weapons. In the distance the hiding Indians saw two men approaching. They also saw that the two men were armed. Now, to the Indians, armed men could only mean one thing—that they were out to kill! Therefore as soon as the two Quakers were within range the Red Indians shot them dead! Afterwards, when the Indians learned that these two men were Quakers they came and humbly apologized. 'But,' they added, 'the men carried arms!'

Another day the Quakers of a village were sitting silently in their 'meeting-house.' This was really their church, and to sit in silent thought and prayer is their way of public worship. The door of their meeting-house stood open, and a party of Red Indians in all their feathers and war-paint filed past. Then the Indians turned and passed the door again, glancing in with curiosity at the silent worshipping people. Once more they turned and filed past, and then the Indian Chief walked in and his followers filed in after him. The leader of the meeting came down to meet the Chief, with the outstretched hand of peace, and then guided them to vacant seats. All through the worship the Indians sat in reverent silence, and at the close the leader took them to his home and treated them generously as his guests. At the end of the meal the Indian Chief took his host to one side and said, 'When Indian come to this place, Indian meant to tomahawk every white man he found. But when Indian found white man with no guns, no fighting weapons, so still, so peaceable, worshipping Great Spirit, the Great Spirit say in Indian's heart—No hurt them, no hurt them!' So with a final grip of the leader's hand the Red Indian Chief promised that the Quakers should live in perfect safety from the attacks of Red men, and gathering up his followers, he hurried away. Jesus says, 'Have faith in God'; and a beautiful hymn declares:

> Sufficient is Thine arm alone,
> And our defence is sure.

Big Ben.

By the Reverend Leslie E. Soal, Doncaster.

'What doth the Lord require of thee, but to do justly, and to love mercy, and to walk humbly with thy God?'—Mic 6[8].

At the Westminster Bridge end of the Houses of Parliament in London there stands Big Ben, the capital's biggest grandfather clock in its case of stone. Most people think of the name as applying to the whole clock and all its works, rather than to the great bell that supplies the name. It is a wonderful clock, and the nation might well be proud of it. The figures on the face are two feet long, the pendulum is thirteen feet long, and the 'bob' on the end weighs four hundredweights. The great weights are two and a half tons each, and they rise and fall for a distance of one hundred and seventy-five feet. The bell that strikes the hours when you are listening-in weighs thirteen and a half tons, so that altogether Big Ben is a wonderful old clock, and I can never look at it without thinking of a text in the Bible, 'What doth the Lord require of thee, but to do justly, and to love mercy, and to walk humbly with thy God.' And I'll tell you why.

When the big bell strikes the hours it makes a tremendous boom, and if it were not for being cracked it would sound still louder. It waits a long time between the strokes, and takes its work very seriously. Boom—boom—boom, it goes, like a stern old judge slowly pronouncing sentence, or giving a warning. And as a matter of fact, it is doing something like that, for so it was intended from the first. In the reign of Edward I. a poor man who appeared in the police court was fined thirteen shillings and fourpence, and when he appealed to a higher court the Lord Chief Justice said he would let him off if he paid half the amount. Certain people complained that this was not justice, and that the man should have been made to pay the uttermost penny. The consequence was that the Lord Chief Justice was hailed to court, and fined eight hundred marks. And so that it should be a warning to other judges to do the right thing, they spent the money on the first Big Ben! It was put up just at the entrance to the Court of Justice, and every time it struck the judges inside could hear it telling them to do their duty. Sometimes when people afterwards wanted judges to reduce their fines they used to refuse and say, 'I have no mind to build a new clock tower.' Personally, I feel very sorry for the judge who was fined eight hundred marks, but nevertheless, the lesson of Big Ben every time it strikes is worth remembering and acting upon—Be just—Do the right thing—always and everywhere.

---

[1] Dunkerley, *The Arm of God* (Oliphant).

And just as clearly Big Ben says, 'Love mercy.' And because mercy is so beautiful and kind we shall agree that she deserves loving. It happened one day that a sentry from among the King's soldiers was charged before his officers with being asleep while on duty. The penalty for such a serious crime was death. The soldier said that he was innocent. He said that he could prove that he was *not* asleep at midnight on the night in question, because as he was passing up and down on sentry-go he heard Big Ben strike thirteen! When the officers heard it, they said the story was ridiculous, until inquiries were made, and it was proved that Big Ben had actually gone one over the mark that night, and had really struck thirteen times! This soldier owed his pardon and his life to London's fine old clock. If it could speak, it would say, 'I'm glad that I struck thirteen that night; it is better to do too much than too little; be kind, love mercy.' When you listen-in to Big Ben striking the hour remember this deed.

Now the last part of the text is still left. 'Walk humbly with thy God.' The best thing that can ever be said about Big Ben is that it goes on, day after day, week after week, month after month, and year after year, quietly and accurately doing its duty. There is no more accurate public clock in the world. The Astronomer Royal once thought he would test it, so Big Ben had to stand for an examination every day for two months! And during the sixty-one days it was being watched and checked the error in time was less than one-fifth of a second a day. Big Ben stood that examination well, and came out with ninety-nine plus, the reward for steadily keeping on and doing its best. Be like Big Ben. Not in everything, of course. For Big Ben only gets a good wash at long intervals, and always looks down on everybody, and as I said—it *is* even a bit cracked! But you can copy Big Ben in these three things at least—you can do the right thing; you can be kind; you can do faithfully the little duties that come to you every day.

The Christian Year.

SEXAGESIMA.

The Need of loving God with the Mind.

'The Lord our God is one Lord: And thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind, and with all thy strength.'—Mk $12^{29f.}$.

The words of our text are a direct quotation from Dt $6^{4f.}$. That these words were familiar to every Jew is a well-attested fact. According to Josephus, they were repeated by every faithful member of the Jewish community twice a day in the first century of the Christian era. They should, therefore, be an accurate reproduction of the original text. But, as a matter of fact, they are not a correct reproduction. In Deuteronomy the text reads: 'Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy strength.' How comes it, then, that Mark and Luke, when quoting this passage, add a fourth phrase—namely, 'and with all thy mind'? To the Hebrew scholar there is no difficulty whatever here. He recognizes that the two phrases in Mark and Luke—namely, 'with all thy heart' and 'with all thy mind'—are simply two independent and alternative renderings of one and the same Hebrew phrase in Deuteronomy. The first rendering, 'with all thy heart,' reproduces the Hebrew word for word. It is a literal translation; for according to the Hebrews the heart, and not the brain, was the seat of the intellect or mind. Hence the second and later rendering in our text, 'with all thy mind,' is an idiomatic and good rendering. This second rendering stood at first most probably in the margin of Mark or Q as an alternative rendering, and was subsequently incorporated by a later scribe into the text. To recover, then, the original form of these words, we have only to omit one of the alternative renderings. We may omit 'with all thy mind,' and retain 'with all thy heart,' if we are careful to remember that the latter phrase has exactly the same meaning as the former.

This first great commandment we might translate more or less accurately in a modern form as follows: 'Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy mind, and with all thy affections, and with all thy will.'

1. The mind, therefore, is to find its full expres-

sion in our love to God. Now what does this mean? It means clearly this: that God asks us to use our minds in dealing with our religious beliefs and conduct, and not only with our religious beliefs and conduct, but also with all His works so far as they come within our ken. Obscurantist views of the Old and New Testaments made it impossible for the best scientists of the last generation to be members of the Christian Church. Even nowadays there are multitudes of men who shrink from applying their minds to their theological beliefs lest they should be disturbed regarding them, or even be forced to disown them. Surely the creed that cannot bear investigation is in a perilous condition, and can never be a source of strength to a man in the hour when he needs it most.

There are, no doubt, ignorant men who in truth, purity, and goodness reflect wondrously the life of Christ, and in their humility enjoy the unbroken sunshine of His presence. And yet none the less their ignorance detracts inevitably from their sainthood. Frequently, unconscious of their limitations, they congratulate themselves on their freedom from all doubt. But this freedom from doubt, unless it is won in spiritual and intellectual strife, is generally the mark of an inferior and limited intelligence. Faith, if it is living, is ever advancing in its ideals, spiritual, moral, and intellectual.

The ignorant saint, moreover, is not always a humble saint. Indeed, only too often dogmatism, intolerance, and fanaticism follow closely in the wake of ignorance. To most minds, therefore, learning and knowledge are helpful. For learning enables a man to get outside his own limited experience; it supplies him with ethical and spiritual standards transcending his highest attainment; it acquaints him with the goodness, the heroism, and saintliness of men far more highly gifted and far more faithful to their ideals than he is to his own. In fact, such knowledge cannot but humiliate every one of us alike morally and intellectually. But if learning is to be of this helpful nature, it must not be fettered from without, it must be free to go whithersoever God summons it; and so it must often go forth, not knowing whither it goeth. Without such freedom theological learning is but a mere bundle of barren facts and traditions, strung together by some artificial tie. And so such learning becomes the letter that killeth, not the spirit that giveth life. It confuses dogma with the essence of religion. But, as we are all aware, the theology of any particular period is nothing more than an intellectual expression of the religion of that period—if the religion of that period has the power of self-expression. It is changing and human, not permanent and Divine; it is at the best but things seen through a glass darkly, not truths as they shall be known more and more fully in the light of God's Presence.

No Church can be truly Catholic which lays the chief emphasis on the acceptance of certain intellectual formulas. This acceptance of tradition is what is called being orthodox. But, even if the tradition be true, the mere intellectual acceptance of it is of no service.

Furthermore, Christ never intended men to accept tradition without the closest examination. Only the slavish mind accepts it without examination. Thus in Jn 15[15] our Lord says: 'No longer do I call you slaves; for the slave knoweth not what his lord doeth: but I have called you friends; for all things that I have heard from my Father, I have made known unto you.' And St. Paul says: 'Prove,' or rather, 'put all things to the test: hold fast that which is good or true.' So far, then, as a Church lays the chief emphasis on the mere acceptance of intellectual formulas, it is essentially irreligious, and such a wrong emphasis must ultimately issue in the claim to infallibility, in the absolute identification of dogma and religion; in other words, in the identification of a temporary and partial expression of religion—and that often of its least valid expression—with religion itself. We live, when we live truly, by the present inspiration of God's Spirit; our souls are guided and sustained by living truths. And such inspiration and guidance make each generation to a great extent a law to itself. If it belongs to the true succession of the saints, it will be ever advancing onward and upward.

2. Though our subject is the first phrase of the first and great commandment, we must touch briefly on its two last phrases. 'With all thy soul' may be taken to mean 'with all thy affections.' No one should congratulate himself on his religious raptures, unless these raptures are translated into right action. No right emotion is given to us by God to end in its own indulgence. If the generous affection, if the sense of gratitude, if the impulse of mercy and unselfishness, if the aspirations reaching forth to an ideal life in God, fail to lead us to undertake the spiritual tasks in which they were designed to find their fulfilment, then they are so much spiritual waste and serve only to corrupt the heart it was their sole purpose to enlarge and glorify.

3. Next, as regards the words 'with all thy

strength.' The essence of this command is to love God with the will. Hence it is the indispensable complement of the two commandments that precede it. We are to translate all the truths, the leadings, and inspirations of God's Spirit into true and noble deeds, and make our lives transcripts of that of the Divine Master. Our daily life is our religion. If we would be faithful therein, we must love God with all our will. So, the will can never be neutral. It cannot be neutral. It is perforce obliged to act, whether rightly or wrongly. For it is called upon from day to day, from hour to hour, to carry into the actual experience of life the truths that it has learnt. From the fulfilment of such tasks it can neither grant itself nor receive from others any dispensation. He that seeks the blessedness of religion can never escape the burdens and duties that religion lays upon him, and if he fulfils these, even in a very inadequate degree, that blessedness will be given to him in the generous measure of the Master.

Surely it is a fact of the most transcendent importance for the human race, that the command that was issued to Israel fully seven hundred years before the Christian era, and was acknowledged by Israel as constituting the supreme requirements of their faith, was exactly the command singled out by our Lord as the first and great commandment, not for Israel, but for all mankind. And now, two thousand years later, we Christians should feel, more intensely than ever, the obligation of fulfilling the first and great commandment—the first and great commandment in the order in which it is enunciated in the Old Testament and reinforced by our Lord in the New: 'Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy mind, and with all thy soul, and with all thy strength.'[1]

Quinquagesima.

The Threefold Gospel.

'For I am not ashamed of the gospel of Christ: for it is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth; to the Jew first, and also to the Greek.'—Ro 1^{16}.

'For our gospel came not unto you in word only, but also in power, and in the Holy Ghost, and in much assurance; as ye know what manner of men we were among you for your sake.'—1 Th 1^{5}.

'In the day when God shall judge the secrets of men by Jesus Christ according to my gospel.'—Ro 2^{16}.

We wish to deal here with the threefold gospel of Jesus Christ (or rather, with the threefold aspect of that one gospel) suggested in the Pauline passages chosen for the text. In the first phrase—'the gospel'—we have its objective aspect, what it is in itself, in virtue of its inner contents and self-evidencing truth and power. In the second phrase—'our gospel'—we have its social or communal aspect, as realized in the fellowship of believing souls. In the third phrase—'my gospel'—we have the personal, experimental aspect of it, as held in the faith of the individual Christian. As objective, it is fact, and truth, and power, ready to be assimilated, believed, and practised, but as yet unrealized and disembodied. As social, the fact is believed, the faith realized, the power exhibited in the common life of the Church. As personal, the objective fact and truth, held by the Church in trust, is experienced and manifested in the life of the individual.

1. *The Objective Gospel.*—What do we mean by this? We mean by it the 'gospel of Jesus Christ the Son of God,' which implies that Christianity as a religion is founded on, or rather rooted in, certain facts and events in history. It is not an abstract philosophy, it is not an ethical code, it is not a vision of truth; it is a religion which, while fruitful of much philosophic speculation, and of very definite ethical results, and of rich doctrinal developments, consists in the last resort in an historical revelation centred in a definite personality of transcendent beauty and power, and consummated in and through certain events in His life, death, and resurrection.

We are familiar with the attempt that has been made to divorce Christianity from history, and to exhibit it as a theory of life or a programme of conduct which is in no way invalidated by the surrender of the supposed historical positions with which it has hitherto been associated. The religious environment when Christianity arose, they say, was charged with certain vital religious ideas and impulses. Men were universally filled with a passion for spiritual redemption; they dwelt longingly and lovingly on the old-world myths in which this longing had been successively enshrined; and round the figure of an obscure but attractive Jewish peasant, who had a certain vogue in His day as a teacher, these myths were deposited in a rich compost of ideas and doctrines first formulated and disseminated by the Apostle Paul, who was the really creative source of historic Christianity as a creed and a power. In Germany, the land of its birth, this theory is already dead and almost forgotten.

It is the function of the study to deal with the question of evidence; here we will only emphasize the undoubted fact that Christianity as we know it is the fruit of a deep and blessed faith in a revelation that was historic or nothing. It is significant that the earliest creeds contain no theory of life, no code of morals, but a brief, pregnant confession of belief in the facts through which the Christian gospel poured its healing stream into the world; and in thus emphasizing the historic element they show a sound instinct, for it is the facts of the gospel which are the fountain-heads of the ethics of the gospel, the taproot of its doctrinal developments, and the centre of its practical power. The interpretation of these facts has differed in the successive ages and stages of faith, and they will continue to change as time goes on and men's thoughts widen with the process of the suns; but without the facts there can be no interpretation of them.

---

[1] R. H. Charles, *The Resurrection of Man*, 150.

2. *The Social Gospel.*—The first original company which was the germ of the Church was composed, it is true, of individual believers, but from that day to this the converse has been true—the Church is the antecedent fact; the communal faith, that is, has been the matrix or medium in and by which all individual faith has been quickened and fed. So we pass on next to the Church rather than to the individual—the Church as the social embodiment of the gospel. The fact of Christ unquestionably created the faith in Christ. 'The' gospel, thus becomes 'our' gospel. This implies two things: that the objective gospel has power to create a living faith in it, and that this faith has taken historic form in the Christian community or Church. And how potent and persistent has been this power! For two thousand years the story of Jesus has awakened, and sustained, and renewed a certain form of spiritual life among men. Wherever two or three of His people have been gathered together, there He has been, no longer as a splendid but isolated figure in history, but in their very midst as a living Presence and Power. Were it not for this extraordinary projection of Himself along the channel of history, the story of Jesus would long since have been forgotten; but while it continues men will turn back to the records of His earthly life and ministry, death and resurrection, with a passionate interest and an unfading faith. What is it that always keeps men so busy with the origins of our faith? Is it not its historic fruits? Is it hard to believe the story of the Gospels, in these days of a rigid critical temper and of pitiless historic methods? Then, we ask, why is it harder for some of us to disbelieve in it? Because of the existence and vitality of the Church which continues that story—because of the regenerated lives of the men and women who through faith in Him have become new creatures; nay, because His risen life has become our own life and our own joy.

This communal faith has been a mighty power over thought as well as faith. It has quickened theologically into the historic systems of thought; it has blossomed practically into various types of Christian character; it has germinated periodically into political and social reformations; it has awakened men into speculative activity in philosophy, into artistic fruitfulness in painting, music, and architecture, into literary creativeness in poetry and drama, into a fuller and fresher life in a thousand directions. Take away the stimulating influence of the communal faith of Christendom, and what would history have been? We do not know; but we do know that the ages of faith have been the ages of accelerated progress and most rapid advance in every fruitful direction; and that when the lights of faith in the Church have become dim, the higher life of men in the world has grown faint, and fallen stagnant. Every great revival in religion has issued in a renewal of all that makes men great and progressive in every social direction. The race has been at its best when faith in Christ has been at its brightest, when the Church has been at its purest. When 'the' faith becomes 'our' faith in the universal sense, then will the Kingdom of God come to birth, and earth be 'crammed with heaven.'

3. *The Personal Gospel.*—But Paul speaks not only of 'the' gospel and of 'our' gospel, but of *my* gospel. The communal faith was significant to him because he possessed it as his very own.

Our faith, too, must be a personal faith, or it will not finally avail for us. Paul, writing to a Church which held the faith as a social fact, spoke of its members with solicitous and yearning desire: 'My little children, of whom I am in travail, till Christ be born in you.' The first and last word of the gospel is to the individual. A great writer speaks of Jesus as having first awakened that fine sentiment which he calls the enthusiasm of humanity. This, if we may say so, is a very partial and inadequate way of indicating a great fact. Jesus had no love, apparently, for man in the abstract or in his totality. He loved men in the concrete. The State is the political unit; the family is the social unit; but the religious unit is the soul. And it was to souls that He preached; it was to souls that He laid siege with His loving influence and appeal; it was souls He died to save. Therefore, the aim of all spiritual activity is the conversion of individual men and women to the faith of the gospel. The true Church is composed of believers, and all true believers are men who believe on their own account. Only as the Church grows by the addition to its numbers of such believers can it really and truly grow at all.

We cannot live on the faith of others. A life so lived is spiritually parasitic; it is a borrowed life, having no initiative and no propagative power of its own. Faith, indeed, is not faith at all till it becomes a personal faith. Alone we came into the world, alone in the deepest sense we pass through it, alone we must pass out of it. What, indeed, avails it for us that we live among people who are believers, Christians, saints, if we do not ourselves believe? Their faith can bless us in a thousand ways, but it cannot save us; in the end it can but mock us with a sense of its own fulness and of our emptiness.

But when this personal faith awakes in men, what a moment in their life is that! Sometimes like the snapping of a chain, like the breaking open of a prison door, and all things are become new. Sometimes like the slow recovery from a fever, like the dawning of the morning after a night of fear and nightmare. But always it issues in a 'new creation,' turning chaos into order, and barrenness into beauty. It is nothing less than a passing from death into life.[1]

First Sunday in Lent.

The Discipline of Uncertainty.

'Take heed to yourselves, lest at any time your hearts be overcharged with surfeiting, and drunkenness, and cares of this life, and so that day come upon you unawares. For as a snare shall it come on all them that dwell on the face of the whole earth.'—Lk 21[34. 35].

Discipline is not an accident of life. It is its essence. And like most essential things, it is provided for in the constitution of life itself. If it were merely an accident, it might be profitable for us to devise with infinite care its various means and occasions. But being essential, its means and occasions are here already. It is only necessary for us to take serious note of them and turn them to fruitful account.

There are several aspects of this discipline which is imposed upon our lives by their necessary relation to the universal life of things, to that life which we usually term Nature. But we will confine ourselves now to what we are wont to call the uncertainty of life. We have come indeed to believe, as our fathers could not, in a fixed order of succession in the life of Nature. But our belief has its limits. It is theoretical and not practical. We may believe in an undeviating process in the life of Nature, but its particular issues and their particular relation to us remain often as incalculable as they were for the men of a less scientific age. Theoretically life is caught up in a movement of uniform and immutable law. Practically the issues of the operation of that law for each individual life are unknown. Our lives are set in the midst of an ever-baffling uncertainty.

Now it is that uncertainty that makes us. Into the most naturally careless life it has introduced some leaven of discipline. If, indeed, uncertainty were absolute, then doubtless we should never have learned the need of discipline. And, again, if life moved along a path of changeless certainty, discipline would have had no meaning for us. But it is just because there is an assured order whose secrets we almost instinctively learn to obey, and yet whose issues for us we can never count on with certainty, that some measure of discipline becomes not so much a voluntary choice as an imperious necessity. We must learn to guard against a hundred possible risks, and where we cannot hope to evade them we must learn how to meet and survive them. On the lowest plane of life, on the merely material plane, the serious exercise of that discipline is the first sign of man's emergence from the stage of barbarism. And even on that plane the contrasted forms of this necessary life-discipline appear. Even there it is both the discipline which takes risks and the discipline which prepares for them. The pioneers of civilization were the seaboard peoples, the peoples to whom the bounty of Nature was not offered on easy terms, as it was to the pastoral peoples who roamed undisturbed the illimitable plains. They had to take the risks of the great deep; they had to trust themselves to the venture of discovering unknown shores. And against those risks they had to make adequate provision. They were the founders of capital, the savings of the past which prepare the larger future; and they were the founders of the city, the collective life which is possible only through the existence of capital. Before them, the city, the collective life which transcended the family or the wandering group of families, did not exist. Boldly facing the uncertainties of life, they increased indefinitely the fruitfulness of the earth and at the same time evoked the civilities which belong to the collective life of mankind. They induced men who would never otherwise have thought of it to enlarge production beyond their own immediate needs. And in doing so they broke down the barriers of tribal exclusiveness which but for them would for ever have kept men apart.

---

[1] E. Griffith-Jones, *The Unspeakable Gift*, 83.

Now all this is a parable of how man grows spiritually through the uncertainty of life. There is for most of us just enough certainty about life to make us easy-going in the matter of character. We can count on our ordinary moral equipment to carry us through the ordinary dangers which we have to meet. So customary, indeed, are they that we never think of them as dangers at all. They are but the daily chances and changes of our spiritual weather. They urge to no unwonted self-control, they call upon no reserves of moral force, they make none of the extraordinary demands of the unexpected. If life were always thus a thing of moral routine it is certain also that morality would have lost all its force, that the disciplined and trustworthy will which is its life-blood would never have been formed. Fortunately for us, life is not for any of us this placid, equable movement of customary and expected routine. The dark days come to all of us, which try what we are, and which too often reveal a degree of weakness, a lack of moral fibre, which we could never have ourselves suspected. Those days, dark as they are, are our opportunity. We move about among our fellows with the pain of the new glimpse of self-knowledge burning within us. We seem to them to be alive with the fair life of the spirit which they have ascribed to us, which we had confidently thought was our own. But we know that we are in fact but whited sepulchres, full within of the crumbling bones of our poor dead selves. It is a dangerous moment for any soul to have to pass through. But it is also the Divinely-appointed occasion of our renewal. We learn in those hours of strain that we cannot count on life as a calm procession of foreseen and expected certainties, that the unexpected call may any day be made upon our energies, that the temptation whose danger has not been, and perhaps could not be, foreseen may assail us, that we are nothing if we have not stored up the reserve force on which we can draw in any emergency. And then, too, we learn that the soul must gain its real courage, that it can only perfect its self-discipline, in going forth to meet all the dangers which may threaten it. It is at least by facing danger that it will learn where danger can be and ought to be avoided. The prudence which knows how and when to retreat is never gained in the midst of panic. It is always the ripest fruit of courage and often its surest proof.

So it is that the uncertainty of life is the greatest occasion of its discipline. It is just this uncertainty which drives us to seek and to find some hidden ground of certainty within. 'Nature is fickle, we have need of rest,' said Matthew Arnold. And, we may add, we have need of certainty, which is our only ground of rest. The rest of the human spirit lies in the measure of self-sureness it can attain. It is not in spiritual idleness that we can find it, but in the unceasing spiritual activity which is ever gaining the right to trust itself. It is in strenuous reaction against circumstance, not in passive acceptance of it or submission to it, that we are safe. If we could ever secure the outward conditions beyond the reach of chance and change, we should have done our best, or rather our worst, to arrest our moral growth. But that is just the security we can never, fortunately for us, achieve. We ought to strive to secure such a uniformity in outer conditions as will enable all to live, to enter upon the full heritage of life. That is within the scope of human effort, and it is just on that account a responsibility imposed upon us which we dare not even try to evade. But the life-heritage into which all must enter is a heritage of struggle, of watchfulness, of effort. The trial will come at a moment that we know not, it will come in a form which we had not expected.

There is one other thing to be noted in this unexpectedness of spiritual trial. It is unexpected only in the forms which it happens to assume. But however various its forms, it sifts us always in the same way: it presses home upon us at the same points; it tries the same fundamental stuff of character; it proves our courage, our seriousness, our loyalty; it winnows away as chaff the superficial sentiment in which we have deceived ourselves. It is always in all its forms the day of the Lord, the urgency of the judgment of God. It is God that is proving us in all the uncertainty of things, and proving us that we may find the roots of an assured strength in Him.[1]

SECOND SUNDAY IN LENT.

The Reconsecrations of Life.

'And Abram went up out of Egypt . . . unto the place of the altar, which he had made there at the first: and there Abram called on the name of the Lord.'—Gn 13[1-4].

Every man expresses himself and the trend of his life in some characteristic act. Were we to review our lives in some dispassionate hour we would find our ruling desire condensing itself again and again in some decision, or some service, or some repeated word. We would disclose what we are in the make and grain of our nature. The reason why we repeat the same sins, make the same choices, and find our thoughts reverting to the same current, is this truth of our self-expression in a characteristic act. Abram expressed his inward passion in the building of altars. He built nothing else. He never had a secure and settled home in the land, but dwelt in tents as a sojourner in Canaan, and did not possess more of its soil than enough for a grave.

---

[1] A. L. Lilley, *Nature and Supernature*, 61.

What is the meaning of this recurring building of the altar? The altar was not the symbol of his faith. It was not a place of morning or of evening prayer. It was not a consecrated sanctuary where God would be pleased to come. The angels of God hovered round his tent door and met him on the highway. The building of the altar had a definite meaning. It was not only the token and the medium of his covenant with God, it was the place of the reconsecration of his life.

As we pass on in life there recur our times of need, or of high privilege and enlarged opportunity and fresh call, or of defeat and shame. Then we should return to the place of the altar made at the first, and reconsecrate our lives unto the Lord. Let us sum up some of the most marked occasions of reconsecration.

Think, first, of reconsecration *at the changes and vicissitudes of life.* All life is full of change. A man leaves his youth behind him, and steps out into the ranks of the men who carry on the world's work, to find his heart stirred with new ambitions and his feet beset by strange temptations. He begins to see what life may mean for those who fail, and for those who succeed, in its tasks. Although he has built his altar in some day of surrender and acceptance, he needs to rebuild it now, and reconsecrate himself. When every man begins his career, when another personality comes into his intimate life, when a little child is born to him, or when those on whom he has leaned have passed away, the only method of meeting such changes, and of passing through them strengthened and enriched in faith, is to build again the altar, and reconsecrate life unto the Lord.

There are other times, when no new joy or fresh impulse visits us, and no enlarged horizon allures us on. Sometimes our life seems to flow on like a quiet stream. But we come to the rapids, and the current is too strong for the bravest. Sickness lays its hand upon us, and leads us aside from the busy paths of the world's work. We suffer a mortifying disappointment in the thing which we dreamed would crown our life, and we understand the meaning of Crabbe's pathetic cry of 'conquered hope's meek anguish.' We begin to see how little of what we covet is going to be given us, and how certainly the road winds uphill all the way. How shall we meet these disillusioning changes? We shall come back to the place of the altar which we made at the first, and call anew on the name of the Lord. We shall reconsecrate our lives unto Him.

Think of John Bright sitting in the depths of grief, almost of despair, when his wife lay dead and the sunshine of his home was extinguished, and nothing was left except the memory of the gracious life and the too brief happiness which had gladdened him in his two years of married life. But his friend Cobden called upon him; and after wise and tender words of sympathy, he made an appeal to Bright to rise, and throw his moral passion into the endeavour to repeal those laws through whose operation there were thousands of homes where wives, mothers, and children were dying of hunger. Bright responded, and returned to the altar of his faith, and reconsecrated his life unto the Lord. Or, think of Miss Waring, when given her sentence of death which meant a seclusion from the world of broad interests and of happy activities, going quietly to her room, and coming out in the morning with the hymn she had written:

Father, I know that all my life is portioned out
for me,
And the changes that are sure to come, I do not
fear to see,
But I ask Thee for a present mind, intent on
pleasing Thee.

That is the issue of a reconsecration. Not every one may pass through such searching vicissitudes. Not every one may be able to respond to the call with such arresting deeds and words. But every one has his own vicissitudes, and they are his occasions for the reconsecration of his life.

Think, second, of reconsecration *in the progress of our years.* We all realize that youth should have its hour of vigil in which its vow is taken, and that young blood should leap in chivalrous ambition. No life is safe which is not pure, and no purity is safe which is not passionate, and, therefore, loyal to goodness and to truth. But the consecration of a man's youth is not sufficient for his older years. Many a man, who has run bravely in the lush meadows of youth, has reached middle life to find his high ideal blurred, his conscience no longer keenly sensitive to evil, his baser desires mastering his will.

If middle life has its perils and its sad-coloured stories of decline, the temptations and the falls of old age are more amazing still. What are the facts which so often shock and terrify us all? A man has worn the white flower of a blameless life throughout the heyday of his eager youth. He has been a pillar in God's house in the fulness of his powers. In his old age he has almost made shipwreck both of faith and conscience. Young King Saul was so uplifted in aim and desire while he was a youth that he found himself at home among a band of men whose hearts the Lord had touched. In his old age his spirit became haunted by evil, and a foul envy corrupted his magnanimous nature. Young David sang the psalms of a consecrated innocence in the fields of Bethlehem, came forth to face the foes of Israel with an unblanched face, and taught his people to joy in God their Shepherd and their King. In his old age the crown of his purity was taken from him, and the men who loved him walked the streets of his city with their faces filled with shame. It is too possible to begin to run well, and to be hindered, long before the end of the course is reached. Jesus pointed to the truth when He said, 'If a man abide not in me, he is cast forth as a branch, and is withered.' The only mode of safety is to make each new stage in the journey of life an occasion of rebuilding the altar, and calling on the name of the Lord.

Think, third, of reconsecration *after a fall into sin*. Here we must speak with all tenderness of the dark passages in life's history, and speak only to strengthen and comfort. There is no hour when we are so tempted to give up the battle, to think that we have been mistaken and are now discovered to be hypocrites, and to desert from the ranks of God's service, as when we have fallen into some ashaming sin. The peril of a fall into sin does not lie in the misery of its shame, or in the knowledge of the consequent estrangement from God. It lies in the blinding of the eyes, the dulling of the sensibility, the bitter self-mockery, and the callous indifference which follow upon it. The question never is whether we have fallen. 'All we, like sheep, have gone astray; we have turned every one to his own way.' Every man must cry, 'God, be merciful to me, a sinner.' The real question is how a man behaves himself after he has fallen. Judas and Peter are both disloyal to Jesus. But Judas goes out into the darkness, with a maddening remorse, to hang himself. Peter goes out into the darkness to weep bitterly and to come back again with meek confession. Demas and Mark were both numbered with the apostolic company. Demas loved the present world and was taken captive by it. Mark yielded to its power, and in his unworthy fear was unfaithful in the service. But Demas played the traitor to Christ. Mark returned to fight the good fight of faith. What is the secret of the difference? One sinner returns to the place of the altar and reconsecrates his life. The other turns his back and is seen no more.

What, then, is the instant imperative of the man who has fallen into an ashaming sin? Come back to Abram who built the altar. He went down into Egypt in a time of famine. Like most men, he had a faulty streak in his grain, a mean fibre in his nature, a dark spot in his soul. This sublime believer, who went out not knowing whither he went, trembled for his life as he faced Egyptian lawlessness. He played the coward. For many months he lived out a deliberate and continued lie. He said that Sarah was his sister. When his lie had been discovered, and he had been reproached by heathen lips, and his shame was shadowing his heart, he saw the way he should take. He came back from Egypt, and made his way, with his burdened conscience, to the place where he had built his altar at the first. He gathered its stones and rebuilt the altar, and there, in humble confession, he reconsecrated himself unto the Lord.

We live in a different world, meet different temptations, fall into different sins, but our healing is gained by the same reconsecration. Sanctification has been defined as a succession of fresh repentances. We may reach the heart of the truth more securely if we define it as a succession of reconsecrations.[1]

---

[1] W. M. Clow, *The Evangel of the Strait Gate*, 235.

◆

Conversion.

By the Reverend H. J. Dale, Lymington, Hants.

The word 'new' runs almost as a refrain through the Gospels and Epistles. We speak of the Bible as composed of the Old Testament and the 'New' Testament, the latter meaning a new covenant, a new relationship set up between God and man. Jesus spoke of His blood as the seal and sign of a 'new' covenant, and declared: 'A "new" commandment give I unto you.' At a later stage Paul reiterated this thought, and proclaimed that the one entering into such covenant bond becomes 'a "new" man,' 'a "new" creature.' The writer of Hebrews speaks of 'a "new" and living way.' In 2 Peter we read of '"new" heavens and a "new" earth,' while the Seer of Revelation describes the '"new" Jerusalem' and talks of 'a "new" name' and 'a "new" song,' bringing all to a climax in the great utterance, 'Behold, I make all things "new."'

Why, it may be asked, the need for such emphasis upon the word? The whole teaching of the New Testament is answer to the question. Whatever of value and meaning there was in the old covenant relationship and knowledge of God had been superseded and made more real and effective by the new vision and revelation contained in the Christian message of life and love and hope. It is the glorious fulfilment of the old-time expectation embodied in Ezekiel's words: 'I will give them one heart, and I will put a new spirit within you; and I will take the stony heart out of their flesh, and will give them an heart of flesh' (11[19]).

This word 'new,' therefore, is at the heart of the gospel, and consequently is of the very essence of all that is contained in the idea of Conversion. It signifies a new relationship, a changed condition of heart and life, an enlarged sense of responsibility towards God, a true conception of the place and claim of Jesus Christ in the life, an increased understanding of the importance of the readjustment of all purpose and interest in the direction of things spiritual. Conversion is central in the teaching of the New Testament, and at great peril both to ourselves and to those to whom we direct our message shall we let it drop from our Christian appeal and Christian vocabulary.

In the first place, let us think of the mode of Conversion. Though it is an experience that is both real and vital in the soul's relation to God, it is at the same time an experience that we cannot stereotype or compress within the limits of a single mould. To try to do so is to repudiate the idea of variety in the methods of the Divine working and to reduce the activities of God to the mechanical operations of an automaton. The Spirit of God moves along lines other than these. As winter changes into spring, and spring into summer, though we cannot determine the exact moment of the change, so with Conversion. It may be permissible to argue that there is a definite point when the soul surrenders to the call and love of God, but to state precisely when or where is often impossible. Conversion can and may take the form of a sudden and drastic change in the life's course, for we know of too many such experiences to attempt to deny the veracity of them; but, on the other hand, we misunderstand the nature of Conversion and the process of the Divine working completely when we try to insist, as on occasion some do, that all conversions must be of the type of Paul's or others of like kind. The sum of Christian testimony repudiates such an insistence upon conformity to one pattern. As Dr. A. C. Underwood says: 'There is no reason why a youth or maiden brought up in a Christian country and a Christian home should be able to date their conversion' (*The Faith of the Baptists*, p. 24). We should do well to mark that truth more than at present we seem inclined. Given an atmosphere conducive to Christian growth, what is more reasonable than that the young life brought within its influence should develop normally and naturally along spiritual lines? We do not say to our children in the home that they must pass through some prescribed experience before they can be welcomed as members of the family; why is there need to act otherwise when dealing with those who are growing up within the circle of the family of God? It should be the looked-for thing that they will take their place amongst the number of those who are of the children of the Father.

Yet, at the same time, what we have said is intended in no way to make Conversion appear as a chance or indefinite thing. It is a real and definite experience. That is our second point for consideration. If neither mode nor moment can be stated precisely, the experience may, and indeed must, be none the less real and effective. As the normal action of the flower is to turn and open to the sun, so the life will come to learn that its health and spiritual existence depend completely upon God. Conversion is the act of centring everything upon God as He is revealed in Jesus Christ, and the surrender of life with all its varied concerns and interests to Him. In a phrase, it is the recognition of the operation of a power in the life immeasurably greater than oneself. To use a figure employed by Dr. H. Wheeler Robinson, the one making this surrender 'finds that little bay of his individual life, with all its little pebbles, and little shells, and little weeds, flooded by the tide of a great deep over which the very Spirit of God broods.' It is the yielding of all to the gracious authority of the Divine love. Thus, life becomes something really and vitally 'new.' Old affections, past interests, and habits, where such have been at variance with the law of Christ, mean and sordid desires, are set aside, and the soul seeks its power and vitality in willing surrender to the One it has come to recognize as alone competent to achieve for it its highest destiny. That is at once the central and absolutely essential thing, and without it no claim that conversion has taken place can be made; but where such an attitude of spirit is revealed, there we have ample justification for saying that conversion has been effected.

One further thought before passing on. In the converted life there is no necessity for making hard-and-fast rules as to what is permissible and what is not. In this matter the love of Christ will always constrain us. When two human hearts are knit together in the bonds of a deep and perfect affection there is never any question as to what may be done and what not. Love ever and always seeks to please. So in the soul's union with Christ. His will is readily understood, and the heart will ever strive to do those things that shall be well-pleasing unto Him. The supreme and urgent task of the Christian Church is to win men and women individually to Jesus Christ. There is a sense, and a real one, in which the gospel is racial and social in its character and implications, and due emphasis needs to be given to this aspect of its teaching. But behind and before all it is personal in its appeal, and nations and society will be won for Jesus Christ only as He is brought into living touch with the individuals that make up these larger communities.

Lastly, Conversion is progressive. The converted life must be the life in which there are not wanting evidences of growth and development; no soul truly touched by the power of God can remain dormant. Perhaps it is at this point that many within the borders of the Christian Church have failed. They have conceived the notion that conversion is all that is needed, and that once that has been achieved there is little else remaining to be done so far as their own spiritual experience is concerned. But when we do see evidences of a dormant state of spiritual existence in any individual, we surely have a right to question the reality of his conversion. As the physical life grows from infancy, through adolescence, to manhood and womanhood, and as the flower develops under the beneficent influence of the sun, so spiritual advance must take place in the one whose life is surrendered to the controlling and dominating power of the Lord Jesus Christ. Such is not an abnormal, but the natural order of things. It may be granted that development forms the hardest task of the converted soul, but that in no way takes from its imperativeness. Paul realized that this aspect of Christian experience was by no manner of means an easy one, for he exhorted some to whom he wrote to 'work out their own salvation with fear and trembling'—words which suggest the presence to his mind of the labour and striving the Christian type of living entails; yet he was equally eager to add: 'for it is God which worketh in you both to will and to work, for his good pleasure.' Therein lies the secret. Though the task is not an easy one, it is a necessary and by no means impossible one. Where the Spirit of God is truly at work it must be that we grow—'grow in the grace and knowledge of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ.' If this is not happening, then in very truth there must be something amiss, and before God we need to examine ourselves that there may be discovered to our understanding what is preventing the full realization of the great work that at one time we confessed had been begun in our heart. 'Wherefore if any man is in Christ, he is a new creature: the old things are passed away; behold, they are become new.'

Contributions and Comments.

St. James and Theocritus.

No doubt we shall find out, when we have removed the party-wall which divides the court of the Gentiles from that of the Israelites, that we have done good service to both of the separated classes. Especially in literature we shall be able to register our gains, for here the taboo has been peculiarly insolent, and in the matter of dependence of the Oriental mind upon Western learning and its finest expressions it has been hard to make out a case, on account of the warning that there is 'no road this way,' which warning he who runs will read and then run away. Even Christianity did not entirely rid itself of the taboo, nor escape its enforcement. It was still possible, only the day before yesterday, for an author of voluminous knowledge and vibrating insight like Frazer to suggest that there was only a single line of Greek literature to be detected in the New Testament. How little he had studied and how less appreciated our own writings! The fence was higher between Greek and Jew for Frazer than for ourselves; but we still need to practise ourselves in the working out of the truth that God made all men of one parentage, which St. Paul so prettily punctuated by quotations from Greek writers, of whom Frazer and others do not seem to be aware. The books on either side of the barrier must be read as if they were really a part of a single library, and then people will not be so startled at the possibility that Virgil might have touched the skirts of Isaiah, or that Luke might have passed on a smile from Aristophanes.

In this quest it is wise to expect most Greek references from those New Testament writers who write the best Greek, as, for example, the Epistle to the Hebrews (shall we say of Aquila and Priscilla?), or the Epistle to the Dispersion of St. James.

It interested me, for example, to attack the passage in James (3^5), where the little member that talks big is denounced. Modern editors insist on apostrophizing the tongue as follows: *ἰδοὺ ἡλίκον πῦρ ἡλίκην ὕλην ἀνάπτει.*

This is certainly not Greek, and so I will not venture to translate it. We must either replace the *ἡλίκον* by *ὀλίγον* of the Received Text, or else go further in search of parallels and corrections. It should go on, 'And the tongue is a fire, and the wicked world is its wood-pile,' but let us leave the text in its present distressing confusion of order, and see if we can find a parallel locution that may help us.

I suggest that St. James has been reading Theocritus. In his fourth Eclogue we find the following strain: *ὁσσίχον ἐστὶ τὸ τύμμα καὶ ἁλίκον ἄνδρα δαμάσδει.*

> So slight the blow
> That lays so great a hero low.

It will be said that the parallel is remote and does not establish consanguinity. We will come to that presently. At least it is clear that no editor would think of correcting Theocritus' *ὁσσίχον* into *ἁλίκον*, and, on the other hand, if he preferred prose to poetry, he might substitute *ὀλίγον*, which would be subject to criticism from another quarter.

Let us look a little closer into St. James' very poetical speech, bearing in mind the Theocritean language about the little thump that *tames* the big man. We read in the Epistle that 'birds, beasts, and fishes are *tameable* and have actually been *tamed*, but the tongue can no one *tame*.' At this point we suspect a clause has been lost; we should look for a contrast, something like *ἄνδρα δὲ πάντα δαμάζει* ('but itself tames any man').

It is clear from the repetition that James is playing with a word which has caught his fancy elsewhere. Even if we do not add the antithetical clause suggested above, the repetition *δαμάζεται* . . . *δεδάμασται* . . . *δαμάσαι* is suggestive of a literary reference; and this fact, taken with the parallel between the 'fire' and 'the thump,' with their relative slightness in comparison with the results achieved by either, makes it probable that James is under the influence of a Theocritean parallel, which may be entered on the margin. Does the reader say, 'With an attached mark of interrogation'? Two, if you like.

May we restore *ὁσσίχον* to the text of the Epistle? Restore what you will, but not the popular editorial refinement.

RENDEL HARRIS.

Birmingham.

2 Timothy ii. 23–26.

THE force of this passage seems to lie in the metaphor which is first introduced explicitly in v.^{26}, but which actually conditions the form of the entire portion.

(1) The salient words are *παγίδος* and *ἀνανήψωσιν*.

The latter word offers a *constructio pregnans*: 'that they should return to soberness out of the snare' means that, having fallen into the snare in an irresponsible state, they try to get out as soon as they come to their senses. But it may be further remarked that the state of insensibility is itself the snare. In the first place, then, the figure is of men lying intoxicated and ensnared.

(2) In keeping with this thought is the word ἀντιδιατιθεμένους, in which, perhaps, the passive note predominates: 'those who constitute an obstruction.'

(3) The figure thus defined decides the force of παιδεύοντα as 'chastising,' or 'stirring.' 'Instruction' (the alternative sense) is wasted on men whose minds are dazed; they must be roused, if necessary by blows. But the castigation must be administered not vindictively (cf. ἀνεξίκακον), but humbly and with due responsibility.

(4) The meaning, then, of διδακτικόν is that the Lord's servant must have capacity as a teacher, but there is no immediate occasion for the use of it. His present task is to awaken the heavy slumberer to a consciousness of his error and of his danger.

(5) Μετάνοιαν εἰς ἐπίγνωσιν ἀληθείας means such a change of mental attitude as sets a man in the way of apprehending truth; in this case the 'truth' would be the real nature of his own precarious and unseemly position.

(6) In view of all this there is reason in the injunction of v.[23]. Argument with an intoxicated man is eminently unprofitable, for if pressed it will only issue in a brawl, and brawling is no part of a Christian's duty.

It appears, therefore, that the metaphor holds good throughout the entire passage. But it *is* a metaphor. Timothy is not expected to have to deal with any large number of persons 'drunk and disorderly' encumbering the highway. The foregoing survey, however, enables us to connote more accurately the words ἀντιδιατιθεμένους and παιδεύοντα as this writer uses them here.

(*a*) In the former case it is clear that the 'opposition' is characterized mainly by lack of intelligence, as this would be estimated by a Christian apostle. The early usage of διατίθημι (Liddell and Scott, ii. 2 passive) may be of service in rendering the compound: 'those who were *disposed* to obstruct.'

(*b*) Παιδεύοντα will still mean rather to 'chastise' than to 'instruct.' At least the 'instruction' will be of a very elementary character, consisting in reproof, the showing up of faults and the expression of just indignation, warning against peril, and inculcation of shame. 'Instruction' in any advanced sense must be left to a later stage. The teacher must be able to impart it (διδακτικόν) when occasion arises, but he must harbour no resentment (ἀνεξίκακον) at being kept so long occupied in preliminary groundwork.

On the difficulty of interpreting v.[26b] it may be said that of the familiar English versions only R.V.mg. seems correctly to assign the pronouns αὐτοῦ and ἐκείνου. Dr. Moffatt's translation, 'as they are brought back to life by God to do His will,' is attractive but unconvincing. If, however, we agree to relate ἐζωγρημένοι to διαβόλου (= ὑπ' αὐτοῦ), much depends upon the sense in which we read the verb ζωγρέω. Now of its various meanings the most appropriate seems to be 'to spare,' which is but little removed from its primary force of 'to take captive alive, instead of killing.'

If there remains any theological difficulty about 'being spared by the devil for the will of God,' we may look back to the previous verse, where it is said that God may give repentance. The underlying thought appears to be the same in both cases: if men are to be delivered from the snare of sin it is by an activity of God, and if what He has willed man also chooses, not all the power of evil can enslave him. The choice of the unusual word ζωγρέω gains in significance by the translation 'spare'; it is the preservation of life that is the main thought. The Divine will may conceivably be advanced by our being 'taken captive alive' by the devil, but surely the emphasis is less on the discipline than on the hope. While there is life there may be repentance; the power of the Evil One is not absolute. A man's own will must be partner to his own destruction, and to the last there is an open door for escape. The fact that the repentant sinner is thus doubly 'spared' is expressed by the perfect ἐζωγρημένοι, and further, He who grants (δώῃ) to us repentance also limits the power of evil in order to make repentance possible.

The following may be offered as a paraphrase of this section: 'But deprecate (or "avoid") foolish and ignorant questions, because you know that they engender contention, and a servant of the Lord must not be contentious, but rather conciliatory towards all men; he must be able to teach, he must not nourish vindictiveness as with meek authority he chastises those who are disposed to obstruct—in case some day God should allow them so to change their outlook as to gain knowledge of reality, and they should awake to soberness and get themselves out of the snare of the devil, by whom they had been spared for the will of God.' LESLIE H. BUNN.

Louth, Lincolnshire.

Ephesians iv. 28.

ὁ κλέπτων μηκέτι κλεπτέτω, μᾶλλον δὲ κοπιάτω ἐργαζόμενος ταῖς ἰδίαις χερσὶν τὸ ἀγαθὸν ἵνα ἔχῃ μεταδίδοναι τῷ χρεῖαν ἔχοντι. The phrase, ἐργαζόμενος ταῖς ἰδίαις χερσὶν τὸ ἀγαθὸν, seems somewhat vague and unsatisfactory. Throughout the N.T., ἔργασθαι τὸ ἀγαθὸν (to do good) and the synonymous ἀγαθοποιεῖν, which are frequently met with, are generally contrasted with their opposites, ἔργασθαι τὸ κακὸν, κακοποιεῖν, 'leading a good life' as opposed to leading an evil life' (cf. κατεργαζόμενον τὸ κακὸν . . . ἐργαξομένῳ τὸ ἀγαθὸν (Ro $2^{9.10}$): ἀγαθοποιῶν . . . κακοποιῶν (3 Jn 11): (Mk 3^4, Ro 3^8, 2 Co 13^7)). Further, only here is the expression found with a qualification—and that so strangely emphatic as—ταῖς ἰδίαις χερσίν. St. Paul (*sup. et inf.*) has been warning his hearers to refrain from certain vicious practices, stating clearly and definitely in each case the counter practice that is to be followed. 'Wherefore, putting away falsehood, let every one speak truth with his neighbour,' he enjoins (v.^{25}), and 'Let no corrupt communication proceed out of your mouth, but such as is good for edifying' (v.^{29}). So here (v.^{28}) we should expect a like clear-cut pronouncement in place of the vague, 'doing good with his own hands.' How, too, 'good' (in the abstract) is to be 'shared (μεταδίδοναι) with him who is in want,' is rather difficult of conception.

I take ἐργαζόμενος here to mean 'earning' (by working), and suggest the adoption of a variant reading, τὸν ἄρτον for the received τὸ ἀγαθόν, which may have had its origin in a marginal comment, or have been read into the text from its familiar association with ἔργασθαι. The difference between the two readings in uncial or cursive script, is, it may be noted, not great. The passage would then read, 'Let the bandit rob no more, but rather let him labour earning his bread with his own hands, that he may have wherewith to share with him who has lack of it.' Hitherto the robber has been living on the proceeds of banditry, acquired by, and shared by each member of the band, henceforth he is to earn his living by working with his own hands, sharing the proceeds of his labour with him that is in want. In support of this rendering of ἐργαζόμενος I would instance, ἵνα μετὰ ἡσυχίας ἐργαζόμενοι τὸν ἑαυτῶν ἄρτον ἐσθίωσιν (2 Th 3^{12}), which I would translate, 'that earning quietly their own bread they eat it (and not that of others).' W. D. MORRIS.

Kelso.

Entre Nous.

Flora Annie Steel.

The Garden of Fidelity (Macmillan; 12s. 6d. net) is the autobiography of Flora Annie Steel—a four-square garden set with flowers and trees, she tells us; 'A garden where one human soul had laid to rest his loves, his hopes, his fears.' Jowett, Ruskin, Pater, Pattison, Goldwin Smith, Sayce, and other names are mentioned as friends, but the life is 'no record of people I have met, no transcript of other folks' lives, no gossip of this world's doings. Simply a straightforward account of things I have seen and done in eighty-two years.' From the time that she went to India at eighteen as the young wife of a Civil servant —'Steel's baby bride'—she kept a diary. So none of the tints of the picture has faded; here are all the impressions quite fresh that the events of her life made on her.

It is a self-revealing biography. The 'round-faced, high-coloured, with my hair still in curls, though tied up at the back with a bow of ribbon,' young girl is already eager, brushing aside difficulties, thinking for herself and taking her own line; already a musician and a painter of some note, overflowing with life and vitality, and showing intellectual powers that never—in spite of her later output of novels that in their time were literary events—contributed what they might have done to the world's enrichment. She was born a generation too early, and perhaps she was too versatile. She recognizes herself that this was the case, and, speaking of the word, tells the story of a Scottish member of a choir she was training who parried an attack on the purity of his tone by the irrelevant remark, 'Ye see, Mistress Steel, ye're so verrsittle.'

There is a Victorian curtain drawn over all intimate relationships. She was not in love with her husband. 'I do not think either of us was in love. I know I was not; I never have been. . . . It has not made life any the less entrancing, any the less full of what Swinburne calls

Fair passions and bountiful pities
And loves without stain.'

Her husband was, we gather, a capable administrator and a fearless one, but he never liked Government service. He was known as the 'maker of gardens.' Every station that they went to, and they were moved continually, he made beautiful with flowers. Parenthetically we may remark that the daughter says of her father, 'To him my mother was the one entirely right thing in this world.'

Flora Annie Steel was an autocrat and admits it. The people of Kasur want to make her Begum. 'It is a fine Utopia to have, as it were, for my very own. What a tyrant I should have been! What a thorn in the side of any self-respecting British Government!' It was difficult for her to compromise. 'Scene-painting,' she says in one chapter, 'improved my sketching. I learnt how much one had to leave out. How little often produced an effect. That, in life, is one of the hardest lessons to learn; how much to see, how much to leave unseen. Women are specially liable to mistakes in this respect. It is very difficult for them to compromise.'

She did not compromise with injustice in administration. Her knowledge of the vernaculars gave her a semi-official appointment as inspector of schools in the Punjab, and scandals in the administration of the then new university of Lahore came to her knowledge. The fight culminated 'in my husband being transferred to the other end of the Punjab. And when I remained where I was, Government was unwise enough to ask the reason why. My husband, being a wise man, sent me the letter for reply. This I did by saying briefly that I had yet to learn I was under Government's orders, which was true, but the fat was in the fire. "Why don't you keep your wife in order?" wailed a helpless Secretary. "Take her for a month and try," was the amused answer. It was, of course, an *impasse*. So for nearly a year things remained. I did my educational work as usual. They knew it was valuable. . . . At last Mr. Baden-Powell, brother to Sir Robert Baden-Powell, came across indisputable proof. . . . So let it pass. I will not have it in my Garden. But it brought me one experience that is worth keeping there for ever and ever a day. My scholars in the town, nigh four hundred of them—from four to fourteen—had an inkling that I was in a tight place. . . . I was to come to the big school at daybreak. There I should find the door barred, and a noise as of singing birds within. So I was to chant, "Little birds, little birds, why do you sing the night long?" And the answer would come back in chorus, "We sing for freedom, for freedom. Let us go! Let us go!" Then I had to unbar the door with the words, "Fly away, little birds," and the rest would follow. It did follow with a vengeance. Such a rush of four hundred children never was . . . and as they passed they flung at me the spools of cotton which the elder ones had spun during the long night during which *every one of them*, babies and all, had sat up, hungry, thirsty, singing hymns. I was literally snowed under. Afterwards they gathered the spools up, they wove them, they dyed the cloth, they embroidered it, and oh! the delight when I actually came down to school in a dress made by them. I have it still and I shall wear it when my time comes to pass on and find out what life has really meant.'

Mrs. Steel started on the Great Adventure on the 12th of April 1929, and she wore this dress, as she wished. The last chapter is added by her daughter. 'She became much interested in the modern conception of space and time, and read and re-read Professor Eddington's last book. More than ever, she said, she felt the truth of Lewis Nettleship's words, "There is no room for death."'

The best-known of Mrs. Steel's novels was *On the Face of the Waters*. 'Mr. Heinemann told me he had never known a book so universally praised. I do not know if this is so. I only know that it brought me one piece of criticism which I cherish greatly. A perfect stranger wrote to me and said, "I lost my wife in the Mutiny, and after forty years you have enabled me to forgive." That was something worth having.'

There is no space to consider the light the book throws on the India of forty years ago and the India of to-day. The book is well worth reading.

'Pass it on.'

'By the middle of August my husband had taken me up to the nearest hill station of Kasauli, to be the guest of an unseen, unknown Commissioner. But even those who had not been privileged in person to know Colonel Reynell Taylor knew him by repute. He was the *preux chevalier* of the Panjab. It was quite enough for him to know that the young wife of one of his subordinates was helplessly ill in the heat of the plains, for him to offer indefinite house-room. . . . I think he was the most perfect specimen of simple manhood I was ever privileged to meet. I saw very little of him during my six weeks' stay, but the words with which he met my attempt at thanks for his kindness as we said good-bye in the verandah have remained with me all these years. They have been far more useful than any sermon I ever heard: "Pass it on, my dear, pass it on."'[1]

'And being let go.'

With *The Three Half-Moons* (Epworth Press; 5s. net) Dr. F. W. Boreham adds another volume of essays to an already goodly company of predecessors, and being Dr. Boreham it is not necessary for him to make any effort to create the right atmosphere between the reader and himself, for the former will already be filled with a pleasing feeling of anticipation. Still he writes a little introduction. An introduction, he says, to let the cat out of the bag, 'is purely an attempt to create an atmosphere. Life is heavily freighted with such ingenious contrivances. The *Introduction* to a book is the author's way of gripping his reader's hand.

'"Ah," that eager handshake seems to say, "this is excellent! Come right in and take the arm-chair yonder! And now, let's overhaul the universe, talking on planets, politics, potatoes, or on anything that comes to mind!"

'Having observed, through the medium of an *Introduction*, this pleasant ritual, and having reached so perfect an understanding, let us get on! For it's a long while since we met, and I, at least, have much to say.'

One of the chapters is slightly different from the others. It is in the form of an address rather than an essay, and on the text from Ac 4^{23}, 'And being let go, they went to their own company.' Break the chain, says Dr. Boreham, do away with all the restraints and obligations of life and see which way man goes. For the broken chain is *a revelation of the relationships of life*. Every one has his own company, but it is not always easy to see what it is. For propinquity is no evidence of affinity, and companionship does not necessarily indicate kinship. 'In a certain museum, Henry Drummond says, there stand side by side on the same shelf two small boxes filled with earth. A low mountain in Arran has furnished the first; the contents of the second came from the island of Barbadoes. When examined with a pocket lens, the Arran earth is found to be full of small objects, clear as crystal, fashioned by some mysterious geometry into forms of exquisite symmetry. The substance is silica, a natural glass; and the prevailing shape is a six-sided prism capped at either end by little pyramids modelled with consummate grace. The contents of the second box are very similar. Indeed, chemically, the material is the same. The only difference is that the angles of pyramid and prism have given place to curved lines. The appearance is that of a vast collection of microscopic urns, goblets, and vases. Each tiny urn is chiselled into the most faultless proportion, and the whole presents a vision of magic beauty. "Judged by the standard of their loveliness," says Professor Drummond, "there is little to choose between these two sets of objects. Yet there is one cardinal difference between them. They belong to different worlds. The last belongs to the living world, the former to the dead. The first are crystals, the last are shells."'

The broken chain is *a revelation of the restraints of life*. 'Being let go, they went to their own company.' 'They would have sought that company earlier but for the restraints to which they were subjected.' . . . 'We none of us say the things that we feel like saying or do the things that we feel like doing. We submit ourselves to a severe curb. Owing to the restraints imposed upon our goodness, we are not as good as we should like to be. We are conscious of good impulses—impulses that reflect our best selves—but we seldom carry them into execution. We are restrained by the example of others; or by the fear of disapproval; or by counting the cost; or by any one of a thousand considerations. Again, we are none of us as bad as we should like to be. We are living in a good world, and the restraints on evil are incomparably greater than the restraints on goodness.'

It is *a revelation of the releases of life*. A thing only betrays its real character when the restraint is removed. 'I went to a cricket match the other day. After playing a brilliantly fine innings, a popular batsman mishit a fast bumping ball and it soared swiftly skywards. The man fielding at cover-point turned and ran rapidly under it, his eyes on the ball. But why? The ball had gone up among the birds—up towards the stars! But the man at cover-point knew that the ball had no real affinity with birds and stars. He knew that it belonged to the realm of mundane things and that, *being let go* from the force that propelled it upward, it would return to *its own company*.'

---

[1] Flora Annie Steel, *The Garden of Fidelity*, 35.

Dr. Boreham might have added the story that Dr. Benjamin Kidd tells of a young cuckoo which he had tamed and kept in his house. When the time for migration came he noticed that the bird became restless, flapped its wings ceaselessly and looked as if it were in a trance. For nothing can finally force a creature—man or beast—to be content with an alien bondage. 'It was one of the strangest sights,' says Dr. Kidd, 'that I have ever witnessed—this young migratory creature of the air, which had never been out of my house and which had never known any of its kind, sitting beside me in the gloom of our northern winter, and by a kind of inherited imagination flying thus through the night, league-long over lands and oceans that it had never seen.'

But, says Dr. Boreham, there remains one word to be said. It is that while the soul has patriotisms, loyalties, and affinities of its own, they are not of necessity final. They can be changed. 'In his *First Men in the Moon*, Mr. H. G. Wells tells of a magic chemical by means of which Cavor and his companion could neutralize and nullify the attraction of any particular world. The glass globe in which they sailed had curtains saturated in this chemical. The airmen had but to draw those curtains on the side nearest the world on which they found themselves, and they instantly floated off into space. By an adjustment of the curtains they could navigate their weird machine to any sphere they chose. It is an allegory. The attachments of the soul are not final. I may draw a magic curtain and be free from the magnetisms that have bound me. The New Testament is particularly explicit at this point. When the Prodigal Son gathered all together and took his journey into a far country, he went to *his own company*. Being *let go*, he flung off the restraints of home, and lost himself among companions of his own choosing. But, with the disillusionment of the years, his heart swung back to the old roof-tree. He shook himself free from the vicious restraints of the far country, as he had formerly shaken himself free from the virtuous restraints of his father's house. He returned to his home. The company that he had once repudiated became *his own company* after all.'

John xiv. 6.

'"Sometimes the track is difficult," he [Dan Crawford] wrote. "A native guide was leading me along a new trail [on the way down to Elisabethville] to avoid a detour of one day. Being a bit dubious of his direction I asked this proud-as-punch guide *where* we were going. 'The Way?' said he, smiling patronizingly. 'Want to know the Way? *I* am the Way!' said he, as he pointed proudly to his breast, where the hidden knowledge was locked up. I took my text from that; sat down with him in the forest on . . . a fallen tree, and told him . . . of the Blessed One who could truly say, '*I* am The Way that never was a way until I passed along it.'"'[1]

St. John Adcock.

LIGHT.

When you have sought God vainly otherwhere—
Have closed your books, and hushed your idle
prayer,
Too weary and heart-sore
To seek Him any more—

And, loving yet your human kindred, go,
Forgetting self, to work for them, nor know
By lowly paths benign,
You reach the height divine:

Then, 'mid the living world where He hath wrought,
In some chance word, or thought, or glimpse of
thought,
When all your search is past,
You may see God at last.[2]

---

[1] G. E. Tilsley, *Dan Crawford*, 575. An account of this Biography will be given next month.

[2] *Collected Poems of St. John Adcock*, 126.

Printed by MORRISON & GIBB LIMITED, Tanfield Works,
and Published by T. & T. CLARK, 38 George Street,
Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to THE EDITOR, Kings
Gate, Aberdeen, Scotland.

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

In Professor **Baillie**'s book, *The Place of Jesus Christ in Modern Christianity*, there is an interesting piece of expository work in the early chapter in which the writer lays the foundation of his argument. The foundations of Christology, he says, lie deep in the essential experience of the Christian fellowship. It is to an account of this fellowship Dr. **Baillie** gives himself to begin with. He quotes the description of the early Christians in Acts, 'they devoted themselves to the instruction given by the Apostles and to *koinonia*, breaking bread and praying together.'

In this word *koinonia* lies the key to early New Testament Christianity. It had a double meaning. It was a fellowship of believers *inter se*, and a fellowship of the believers individually with the Spirit, but a complex experience which included both. When we ask what this new relationship was we come upon another great word, *agape*. In these two words we can sum up New Testament Christianity. The word *agape* is nearly unknown to us outside the Christian use of it. It is translated 'love,' but the trouble is that 'love' covers also the Greek word *eros*, which the New Testament scrupulously avoids.

Dr. **Baillie** suggests that when it applies to God *agape* should be translated 'fatherliness,' and when it applies to man 'brotherliness.' But the real difficulty is that it often applies to both. It is often regarded as a triangular relationship in which the Christian's attitude to God is closely related to his attitude to his brethren, and in which this attitude to his brethren is modelled upon God's attitude to him.

The secret of the little band's influence, then, lay in the fact that in its meetings it was enjoying this *koinonia* of *agape*. How, then, did this work out in the actual detail of life? Through the family idea. God deals with us, and we ought to deal with our fellows, in the spirit of family affection. But if we are to understand this fellowship of love we must look at it on its two sides separately. *Agape* obtains first between man and man, and in this aspect the word used generally is 'brotherhood.' This, says Harnack, is the 'fixed and frequent title' that answered to the Christian's life and conduct. It means that we are to do for all those with whom we have dealings what the meanest of us does for his own flesh and blood.

Now this implies that *agape* is, first of all, a *redemptive* love. As von Hügel says, it is 'a love that loves, not in acknowledgment of an already present lovableness, but in order to render lovable in the future what at present repels love.' But that is not all. We do not penetrate to the heart of the matter until we realize that *agape* is in addition *suffering* love, a love that involves pain and sacrifice if it is to be redemptive. The world being what it is there can be no effective helping of our fellows except through self-sacrifice. But suffering is not the last word. *Agape* is also a *joyous* love. Triumphant hope is the keyword of early Christianity, the faith that love is stronger than death. No gospel of mere renunciation, however nobly represented, could have had in it the tremendous power of spiritual appeal which the faith of that little Christian band has ever since proved itself to possess.

What is distinctive about the Christian fellowship is its perception that in this *agape* is to be found the secret of the further spiritual development of the race. It is the great spiritual discovery for which Christianity stands, and it is certain that it was in the nature of a discovery even to men who had been reared in the faith of Israel. Comparing Jewish benevolent righteousness (*chesed*) with Christian *agape,* that learned Jew of our time, Dr. Claude Montefiore, allows that the latter stands for 'something more venturous, more self-sacrificing, more eager, more giving, than can honestly be said to be connoted by righteousness or goodness. It is a virtue which does in its height "cause a man to lay down his life for his friend." It is a virtue which drives a man forth to save, to redeem, and to forgive.'

But *agape* is also the attitude of God to man. Here we have to do not with a different kind of love from that which we have been considering, but with the same kind. Just as the New Testament *ethic* is summed up in the words, 'Be under no obligation to any one except the obligation to love one another,' so the New Testament *religion* is summed up in the words, 'God is love.' It is in God 'fatherliness.' It is in us 'sonship.' And about this relation Paul emphasizes two things. The first is its informality, the readiness of access we have to the Divine presence. In the Christian fellowship, he says, 'we have the right of free speech and access in confidence.' The second thing is its graciousness in respect of our sins and failures.

The central affirmation of the New Testament, then, is that the eager, patient, forgiving love which is our pattern is enthroned in the highest heaven as the Spirit manifested by the Most High God in His dealings with us. It is in God also a redemptive love. And in Him also, in order to be redemptive, it is a suffering love. If our little human enterprises of redemption are costly to us, how much more costly the redemption of the world to God! And yet, as the last word about human love is not the tragedy of suffering but the triumphant peace and joy of eternal life, so the last word about God's love is the unchanging serenity of eternal perfection. There is an everlasting Divine joy, a peace of God which passeth understanding, before which the last remaining shadow of sorrow and suffering must flee away.

In the recent volume of Essays on *The Atonement in History and in Life*, there is an essay by the Most Rev. C. F. D'Arcy, D.D., Archbishop of Armagh, whose expositions of theistic thought on Bergsonian lines have been interesting and suggestive contributions to philosophical theology. The essay in question is on 'Atonement and the Problem of Evil,' but its emphasis is on the problem of evil rather than atonement; and it is just because a fresh approach to this perennial problem is always of interest that we would call attention to the essay.

Dr. D'Arcy remarks first on the universal tendency in human thought to link up the two forms of evil, physical evil or pain and moral evil or sin, and to regard them as somehow interdependent. 'The history of punishment, and the various doctrines connected therewith; the impulse to regard suffering as penalty inflicted by superior powers, witness the Book of Job; the idea of *Nemesis* in Greek thought; the Eastern conception of suffering and degradation as the result of sin in a former incarnation: all these reveal a conviction in the mind of man that sin and suffering cannot be separated.'

But the fact of animal suffering tends to qualify this ancient conviction. The lower animals are certainly subject to pain, and yet in no sense are they guilty of sin. Yet until the theory of evolution there was no rational explanation of the suffering of animals. In the light of evolution we may now look upon pain, not as punitive, but as a specific and positive element in the development of animal life, or, as Dr. Wildon Carr expresses it, as 'a biological factor with a distinct psychical function.' Pain thus possesses a utilitarian value.

Even so the real problem of physical evil still awaits solution. Sensitivity to pain is no doubt a useful element in animal life, but there appears to be an excess of pain in the world, and this constitutes the difficulty. And the higher we ascend in the scale of being, the more keenly is the difficulty felt. And further, the worst sufferings of men are not physical at all: they are hurts of the soul, disappointments, fears, social injuries. These can hardly be represented as of biological value. And yet further, when all is said from the evolutionary standpoint in mitigation of the problem of physical evil, the problem of moral evil remains.

One way of solving the problem of evil, of eliminating the irrational element from the universe, is by denying the reality of evil. According to Christian Science both sin and pain are illusions of the human mind. 'If by a great act of insight we can rise to the conviction that God is all and that God is good, these unrealities, sin and suffering, will vanish into nothingness, the afflicted soul and the afflicted body will both pass into a condition of health and happiness.' Although this doctrine was extravagant in its expression, it appears to bear an essential resemblance to those negative or privative theories of moral evil for which great names have stood as sponsors, such as those of Augustine, John Scotus, and Thomas Aquinas. From this negative point of view moral evil is related to good as shadow to light, or as silence to sound.

But it is an abstract point of view, designed to save in the face of evil the goodness of God, and is not based on the facts of experience. A similar criticism applies to the solution offered by evolutionary science, according to which moral evil is a survival of qualities and modes of action which belonged to more primitive stages in development, being the unnatural and blameworthy persistence of brutal instincts in the life of man. Which brings us back, by another path, to the idea that sin, if not an unreality, is entirely relative to thought and habit. In confutation of all these views, of the Christian scientist, the philosophic theologian, and the modern evolutionist, we need only appeal to the actual facts. These would seem to show us that an evil deed or an evil character is just as positive an existence as we can imagine.

Moral evil being then no unreality, no mere defect or negation, but a real and positive thing, let us consider whether we may find any true light upon the problem it sets. If the source or seat of it is in the will, we may say that the moral situation is created by the will's exercise of its inherent power or freedom, the choice of the good implying the possibility of evil. Are, then, the whole course of history and the realization of the Divine purpose at the mercy of man's will? It is a question which presses more insistently under the scientific story of Creation, with its long record of pain and struggle, than in the old story of our childhood. 'The Creator, if there be a Creator, seems far more directly responsible for the sufferings and sins of His creatures than He appears to be in the Biblical account. For, in the scientific account, the fierce competition which brings pain and sin is part of the order of things from the beginning.'

Yet the narrative of the Fall as we read it in the Book of Genesis expresses the fundamental principle of all life. Spontaneity of action can be traced from its lowly beginnings in the *amœbæ* through the long history of developing life until we reach its highest point in man. Out of the acquisition of sensitivity, some degree of awareness, some inward urge of feeling, sprang what we call mind and will. Thus pain and sin, the two forms of evil, come from the same root, and, linked thus in their origin, interact in their history; and through their interaction the moral life of humanity is created. 'It is in choosing the good and rejecting the evil that the will finds its highest exercise; and the conditions which enable this choice to be made involve as their very essentials the sentient life of pleasure and pain, and the moral elements of good and evil. The actuality of pain and the possibility of evil form the school of discipline in which man is made.'

'From this natural history of suffering and sin, we gather that moral evil is not an essential element in the total scheme of things, nor, on the other hand, is it an unreality. It is a state of human life arising, though not necessarily, from the contingency which must belong to any order of things in which moral and spiritual attainment is possible.'

Does the contingency which is an essential condition of moral life account for the enormous development of evil in human life and history? Or, is this only to be explained by some doctrine of original sin, some inbred evil tendency in human nature? Dr. N. P. Williams thinks that evil must be traced to a premundane Fall of the Life-Force—so reviving an old theory. Dr. Tennant's is a more reasonable theory, regarding the sinful tendency as the survival or persistence of the crude animal tendencies which, at first natural, became with the emergence of man's moral nature the source of evil. But in any case we may conclude that the creation of beings capable of moral faculty and moral conduct involved the possibility of evil.

This is a position which is generally affirmed by theistic thinkers, but Dr. D'Arcy imparts a Bergsonian flavour to his affirmation of it. He represents God as the Supreme Adventurer, of whose venture we cannot be certain that it will be justified; and he maintains that the conception of an Adventurer God is infinitely more worthy of our acceptance than is the idea of a Supreme Being who makes us to be all that we are, whether good or bad, in order to promote His own glory. For the first, as we may observe in Bergsonian phrase, the gates of the future are open, for the other they are closed.

And yet, although our reason finds itself limited and confounded when it passes from the lower levels of reality to the consideration of spiritual beings possessed of mind and will, for God the supreme Reality there must be a final Unification. It may surpass our thought, but we must believe in its existence. 'We may, indeed, venture to think that what we call the Love of God, embracing all His creatures, is the best and fullest expression of the ultimate truth.' 'Here, it would seem, is the essence of the Christian doctrine of the Trinity, which means just this—that in God there is a principle of Unification higher in kind than any known in experience.'

We shall not follow Dr. D'Arcy into his discussion, brief as it is, of the relation of his conclusions to the idea of the Atonement; we are content to quote the closing words of his main discussion: 'If this way of regarding the problem as a whole be sound, we find that we have a real explanation of the reason why the problem of evil has shown itself to be, for every philosophy, an insoluble problem. Evil cannot be rationalised, because it has to do with just that point where the categories of rational thought have reached their limit.'

A third edition of *Essays Catholic and Critical* has been published (S.P.C.K.; 10s. 6d. net). No one who has read its able and scholarly pages can wonder at its popularity. But in the third edition the editor, Dr. Selwyn, takes the opportunity to reply, in a long preface, to some of the criticisms (including our own) passed on the book when it first appeared. He deals chiefly with two points, the claim to authority and the relation of Anglo-Catholicism to the results of Biblical criticism.

As regards the first point Dr. Selwyn quotes from The Expository Times the following sentence, 'If authority rests on Christian experience, surely those great Churches (Free, Lutheran, etc.) have some authority to plead. But if the Christian experience of these bodies is to count in assessing the authority of any truth, what becomes of the Anglo-Catholic contention?' The editor's reply is that this is a misunderstanding of the Anglo-Catholic claim. That claim is not that Anglo-Catholicism gives a final and exclusive expression of the truth, but that it represents the best expression at present available, in thought, worship, and life, of the principles necessary to an ultimate synthesis. It is interesting to have this definition of the limits which should be put to the claim to authority. It is a much more modest claim than is usually associated with Anglo-Catholicism.

But Dr. Selwyn returns to the subject of authority later, and is quite explicit. Authority may be objective or subjective. The latter is generally known as the Inner Light, or sometimes as 'private judgment.' The weaknesses of the subjective claim are obvious. It will never satisfy those who long for some one, or something, that will say to them, and have the right to say to them, 'this is *true*!' But if the authority is objective, where does it lie? In the Creeds? In the Church? In the Bible? As to the first of these Dr. Selwyn says some fine and true things. The Creeds are expressions and safeguards of the worship of Christ. And they are the expression and embodiment of the *common* experience of the grace of Christ.

And then Dr. Selwyn, with felicity and courage, proceeds to define the source, the seat and the organ of authority in the Church of Christ. Its *source* is the Spirit of God in the Scriptures, in the unity and development of Christian doctrine, and in the conversion of souls. Its *seat* is the common mind of the Church. This is not found in any one mode, but it is accessible and real. Creeds and liturgies embody this, and whatever expresses the experience of God's grace. We suppose that Dr. Selwyn would include the Free Churches at this point. It is the weakness of Modernism, he says, as of Liberal Protestantism, that they have failed to allow for the authority of this Christian experience.

The question of the *organ* of Catholic authority presents a more difficult problem, and one on which Dr. Selwyn finds it hard to be definite. The difficulty arises from the divided state of the Church. For Romanism there is no problem at all, because the Pope is the infallible spokesman of God. For others there can be no single 'organ.' There must necessarily be 'organs.' This is so, says Dr. Selwyn, 'so long as the collective episcopate cannot meet.' In this phrase he seems to exclude all non-episcopal Churches. What this imperfect state of things means, he says, is that the pronouncements of the divided Churches are incomplete, since they rest upon, and apply to, only a part of the whole field of Christian experience. The position is not a final one, but it is, we are assured, strong enough to rest in, until such fresh illumination is given as can alone make the solution of the difficulties possible.

The weakness of this position from the Anglo-Catholic standpoint is terribly obvious. There seems to be no half-way house between the Roman claim and the position that authority in religion rests with the achievement of the Spirit of God manifest in the witness of Christian experience which we can read in the Creeds and in the worship of *all* the Christian Churches. Even the meeting of 'the collective episcopate' would not be enough. The Free Churches, the Lutheran Churches, the great Churches of America have also their part in forming the authority which comes from the Spirit. It is, however, a gain to have this clear and candid discussion of a great problem set before us in such a fine spirit.

With regard to the other topic dealt with in this interesting preface, the relations of Anglo-Catholicism with the critical movement, our sympathies are rather with Dr. Selwyn than with his critics. Dr. Selbie urged, when this book first appeared, that it attempted the impossible in trying to bring into synthesis the Catholic and critical movements. That is rather a dangerous thing to say of any strong Christian position. Frederick Robertson of Brighton taught some of us long ago that truth is never found between extremes, but always in bringing together the half-truth in each extreme. And this would seem to describe the Anglo-Catholic attitude. There is a truth in the critical attitude, and so far as it is true the Anglo-Catholic writers here accept it. Why not? For they also accept the other truth of Christian experience, which is as much a truth (or half-truth) as the truth of 'science.' Dr. SELWYN'S remarks on this topic are very illuminating and will seem convincing to most minds. There does not seem, in the nature of things, any reason why an Anglo-Catholic should not also be a higher critic.

◆

National Contributions to Biblical Science.

II. The Contribution of Great Britain to Old Testament Study.

BY THE REVEREND PRINCIPAL H. WHEELER ROBINSON, M.A., D.D., REGENT'S PARK COLLEGE, LONDON AND OXFORD.

1. THE scientific study of the Old Testament means the examination of its elements by the full employment of all the general methods of literary and historical study—linguistic, archæological, geographical, anthropological, comparative, even theological and philosophical, always provided that the literature shall be allowed to speak for itself without conscious correction by any of the vested interests of Church or Creed. The aim of this article is to review the chief contributions made to this study by British scholars, exclusive of those who are still living, and to steer, if possible, between the Scylla of subjectivity and the Charybdis of a mere bibliography. Fuller details, including those relating to other countries, will be conveniently found in *Founders of Old Testament Criticism*, by T. K. Cheyne (1893), the Introduction to *The Hexateuch*, by J. E. Carpenter and G. Harford-Battersby (1900), the article on 'Criticism (Old Testament),' by J. Strachan in vol. iv. of the ENCYCLOPÆDIA OF RELIGION AND ETHICS (1911), 'The Legacy of Israel' (*Hebrew Studies in the Reformation Period and After*, pp. 353–373, by Canon Box, 1927), *Theologie der Gegenwart in Grossbritannien*, by W. Vollrath, pp. 48–81 (1928).

2. If we leave out of account the great series of translations of the Old Testament into English, our scientific contribution may be said to begin with the London *Polyglot* (1654–57), of which we may justly be proud.[1] An added interest is given to these six great folios when we remember that its editor, Brian Walton, turned to this task after being ejected from his livings in 1641. The four Old Testament volumes open to show the Hebrew text with half a dozen versions, each with its Latin rendering. To this monumental work, for which the editor justly claimed the *aere perennius*, there was added in 1669 Edmund Castell's sevenfold Lexicon in two companion folios. Naturally the foremost Orientalists of the time were associated with Walton, such as Edward Pococke (1604–91), remembered also for his commentaries on Minor Prophets, and John Lightfoot, best known by his *Horae Hebraicae et Talmudicae* (1658–78). To the same period belong two scholars whose interest lay rather in the Biblical manners and customs than in linguistic study, namely, John Selden, known by his *De dis Syris* (1617), who died in the year of publication of the *Polyglot*, which he had helped to finance, and John Spencer, whose pioneer work in the comparative study of Hebrew institutions was published in 1685 (*De Legibus Hebraeorum Ritualibus*). To the next generation belongs the textual work of Humphrey Hody (1704), and to a still later period that of Benjamin Kennicott (1776–80), and (on the LXX) of Holmes and Parsons (1798–1827). The outstanding name of the eighteenth century in regard to subject-matter is that of Robert Lowth, whose *Sacred Poetry of the Hebrews* (1753) gives the pioneer and classical treatment of Hebrew poetic parallelism. He also illustrated his insight into the poetic form of Hebrew prophecy by his annotated translation of Isaiah (1778).

3. The literary or 'higher' criticism of the Old Testament began in Great Britain with Alexander Geddes (1737–1802), who followed up the pioneer work of Astruc (1753) and Eichhorn (1780) on

---

[1] Its international significance may be illustrated by the fact that my own copy of it was catalogued in the library of the Bare-footed Carmelites at Riom in 1711.

the Continent by more or less independent work of his own. They made what seems likely to be a permanent contribution to the subject by analysis of the Pentateuch into two principal documents. The theory of Geddes was that it was a collection of very varied material (though including the journals of Moses) first compiled in the time of Solomon (*The Holy Bible*, 1792, 1797; *Critical Remarks on the Hebrew Scriptures*, 1800). This theory has been defeated by the developments of Eichhorn's, but it won attention and support on the Continent, and Geddes deserves to be remembered as the pioneer of Old Testament criticism in this country. He was the first to see that the problem is Hexateuchal and not simply Pentateuchal, and that the compilation of the sources must be placed considerably later than the Mosaic age. The distinction of Geddes is the more apparent because he found no British successor for more than half a century; only then was the mantle of the Scottish Romanist priest inherited and shared by an Irish Congregationalist tutor and an English Anglican bishop—a good example of the catholicity of the search for truth. The name of Samuel Davidson (1806–99) is commemorated by a recently founded Professorial Chair of Old Testament Studies in the University of London, with the significant proviso that 'there shall be no restrictive conditions as to the religious or theological beliefs, convictions, or denomination of any candidate'—significant because Davidson had to resign his tutorial post in the Lancashire Independent College on account of his work on Old Testament Introduction published in 1856. The case of Bishop Colenso is much better known; he was excommunicated (though afterwards legally restored) in 1863, on account of his Pentateuchal criticism.[1] But neither Davidson nor Colenso made any independent contribution to the subject.

4. Meanwhile attention was being paid to other sides of Biblical study. The science of Assyriology, obviously so important for Old Testament science, began with excavations by the Englishman, C. J. Rich, in 1811 and 1820, and found notable representatives in A. H. Layard (1845) and George Smith (1873). Edward Hincks was in 1846 a pioneer in the decipherment of Babylonian. Thomas Young was in 1817 a pioneer in the decipherment of Egyptian hieroglyphics, and contributed materially to the success of Champollion in 1822. W. M. Thomson's classical work, *The Land and the Book*, showed what could be done by a faithful observer of the manners and customs of 1857, now beyond recall. The invaluable investigations of the Palestine Exploration Fund are well known. Doughty's great work, *Arabia Deserta* (1888), was based on his travels of 1875–78. At first sight such a book may seem to fall beyond our present subject; yet, in fact, there is no book which can so re-create for us the atmosphere and incident of much of the Old Testament life. The tradition of Walton's *Polyglot* was continued in this period, on a smaller scale, in the patient scholarship underlying Field's *Hexapla* (1875), and the textual work of Holmes and Parsons found its successor in the work done by H. B. Swete and others on the LXX (Manual edition, 1887–94). C. D. Ginsburg devoted much time and energy to the exact study of the Old Testament text (1894). In the years between 1892 and 1906 the great *Concordance to the Septuagint* of Hatch and Redpath was added to the indispensable reference books of the student. The great *Thesaurus Syriacus* of Payne Smith (1818–95) is equally indispensable for the study of the Syriac versions.

5. The teaching work of A. B. Davidson (1831–1902) extended over nearly forty years, and probably most British students of Hebrew in the present generation have been brought up on his *Hebrew Grammar* and *Hebrew Syntax*. His commentaries on 'Job' and 'Ezekiel' in the *Cambridge Bible* and his dictionary articles (*e.g.* 'God' in Hastings' *Dictionary of the Bible*) show that deep religious interest in the Bible which has usually been characteristic of British scholarship. It is unfortunate for Davidson's literary reputation that his posthumous *Theology of the Old Testament* was ever published, since it is a conglomerate of lecture notes representing different stages of his slow development on critical questions. The posthumous book, *Old Testament Prophecy*, is more of a

---

[1] The Episcopal bench tried to get a resignation from Colenso, and Archbishop Longley is said to have communicated their desire to him as follows:

> My dear Colenso,—With regret,
> Your brethren all, in conclave met,
> Request you—most disturbing writer—
> To give up your Colonial mitre.
> This course I beg to urge most strongly,
> And am, yours very truly, Longley.

Colenso's reply was:

> My dear Archbishop,—To resign
> This Zulu diocese of mine,
> And own myself a heathen dark,
> Because I've doubts about the Ark,
> And think it right to tell all men so,
> Is not the game for yours, Colenso.

unity. But the great work of Davidson was the practical one of training and inspiring students of the Old Testament through a long and critical period, rather than in any marked contribution to the literature of the subject, at least commensurate with his solid scholarship.

The most distinguished British representative of Old Testament studies during the nineteenth century was undoubtedly W. Robertson Smith. His brilliant articles in the *Encyclopædia Britannica* began in 1875; the monograph on *Kinship and Marriage in Early Arabia* appeared in 1885; the three Old Testament books of that decade are still indispensable to the student, viz. *The Old Testament in the Jewish Church* (1881), *The Prophets of Israel* (1882), *The Religion of the Semites* (1889), the last, in particular, having become an international classic. The originality of Robertson Smith's comparative work, to which his Arabic studies specially contributed, is fully recognized by continental scholars.[1] His work illustrates the characteristic British interest in anthropology and folklore. The ecclesiastical battle for the rights of scholarship which he fought in 1878 was of great moment, and did much to popularize Old Testament science. It is significant of our British attitude that we are never content with the prewar German divorce between university and pastoral teaching. We rightly feel that truth does not allow of this compartmental treatment. Even the protests of obscurantism and literalism reveal the true instinct, that the conclusions of scholarship are vital to religion.[2] Robertson Smith's strong religious interests have been shared by most British Old Testament scholars.

Cheyne's contributions during his earlier (pre-Jerahmeelite) period were of very high quality. His original mind, fine scholarship, and attractive English style enabled him to do work that stands the test of the passing years better than that of most. His little commentaries on 'Micah' (1882) and 'Hosea' (1884) in the *Cambridge Bible* are still of real value, even for scholars; his *Isaiah* (1880) was the best of its time; his *Job and Solomon* (1887) first revealed to many the fascination of the Wisdom literature; the first edition of his *Book of Psalms* (1888) is still the best commentary for the English reader, whilst the fine study of *Jeremiah* in the same year revealed his spiritual sympathy with the most fascinating of the Old Testament prophets; his *Origin of the Psalter* (1891) cannot be neglected.[3] The lectures on *Jewish Religious Life after the Exile* (1898) reviewed (less successfully) the period with which he had been chiefly concerned. Much of his work in the *Encyclopædia Biblica* and elsewhere was marred by excessive emendation of the text, but this should not obscure the fact that Cheyne ranks as one of our best commentators, one who combined critical scholarship and spiritual sympathy to a very high degree.

The work of S. R. Driver lacked just that touch of inspiration which marked Cheyne's, but was conspicuous in that quality of balanced judgment which Cheyne's later work lacked. Driver's unremitting toil ('If you want to learn Hebrew, make lists, make lists'), his cautious testing of every theory and patience with its details, his sober judgment and full appreciation of the religious issues involved—all these combined with his outstanding scholarship to give him a place of the highest influence in the Old Testament studies of this country. His *Hebrew Tenses* (1874) developed into an essential handbook for the Hebraist, and the most thorough treatment of its subject in any language, though modern syntactical and comparative study of Hebrew seems inclined to modify the 'logical' theory on which the book is based. His *Deuteronomy* (1895) and *Genesis* (1904) admirably represent (in different ways) that union of devout faith and thorough scholarship which most appeals to us in this country. His *Hebrew Text of the Books of Samuel*, with its important Introduction on Palæography, has educated many a Hebraist and has set a high standard for all work of that kind. It is, however, the *Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament* (1891) which has exercised the widest influence of all the author's books, whilst the differences of the successive editions show the progressive conservatism of his mind. This very quality gave him a greater influence over his contemporaries, and no man has done more than Driver to widen the basis of the scientific knowledge of the Old Testament in this country. His Schweich Lectures on *Modern Research as illustrating the Bible* (1908) show his sane position in the quite artificially created feud between archæology and literary criticism, whilst his book on *Isaiah* shows the breadth of his interests.

---

[1] A well-known German Professor said to me in 1899 that Robertson Smith was the only really original worker we had in Old Testament studies.

[2] This may be illustrated by the remark of an old Scotswoman, who was much perturbed by Cheyne's work, as reported in the religious journals of the time. To my suggestion that he was at least a man of fine Christian spirit, she sternly replied, 'He's waur when he comes as an angel o' licht.'

[3] The 'Introduction' is of value both autobiographically and as a review of the progress of Biblical criticism in this country.

6. The triumvirate of Robertson Smith, Cheyne, and Driver stands above all the rest of the names that might properly be remembered here, *e.g.* Perowne, Ryle, Kirkpatrick, Whitehouse, Bennett, Ball (distinguished also as an Assyriologist), and Addis. The criticism of the Hexateuch is most elaborately represented by the Oxford *Hexateuch*, edited by J. E. Carpenter and G. Harford-Battersby (1900). But it is fitting that more should be said of the four distinguished Old Testament scholars whom we have lost in the last few years—Buchanan Gray, Burney, Skinner, and Peake.

G. B. Gray (d. 1922) was recognized at home and abroad as one of our leading Old Testament scholars. His monograph on *Hebrew Proper Names* (1896) at once gave him his status, and his subsequent work as a commentator on *Numbers* (1903), *Isaiah i.–xxvii.* (1912), and *Job* (with Driver[1]: 1921), is of first-class quality in its thoroughness of technique. His well-balanced judgment is illustrated by his study of *The Forms of Hebrew Poetry* (1915), as also by his *Critical Introduction to the Old Testament* (1913). The posthumous book on *Sacrifice in the Old Testament* (1925) lacks the completeness and co-ordination which the author would have given to it in his own revision, but even so it remains one of the most important books on the subject. Whatever Gray did he did thoroughly, and his standard of thoroughness was a rebuke to most students.

C. F. Burney (d. 1925), who succeeded Cheyne in the Oriel Professorship, was a scholar of massive knowledge and concentrated purpose (who owed a great deal to the teaching and influence of C. J. Ball). Burney has left us two books of first-class quality for the student of the Old Testament, besides other work that lies outside our subject, viz. the *Hebrew Text of Kings* (1903), modelled on Driver's *Samuel* and a worthy companion to it, and the elaborate Commentary of *Judges* (1918), which contains important contributions to the early history and religion of Israel.

J. Skinner (d. 1925), another first-class Hebraist, has left two books of outstanding distinction—the commentary on 'Genesis' (1910), worthy to rank with the best of its rather varied companions in the *International Critical Commentary*, and *Prophecy and Religion* (1922). These studies (in Jeremiah) form one of the best modern examples of the marriage of deep spiritual insight with the acute criticism of the scholar. His 'Kings' in the *Century Bible* is an admirable example of more elementary work (note the 'Introduction').

A. S. Peake (d. 1929) was a scholar more interested in the theological subject-matter of the Old Testament than in its linguistic or archæological sides, and his attention was partly given to New Testament studies. His *Problem of Suffering in the Old Testament* (1904) and the small commentaries on 'Job' and 'Jeremiah' in the *Century Bible* are excellent in their way; how far his long-expected Commentary on *Isaiah xl.–lxvi.* had advanced remains to be seen. He was an ideal editor, and did more than any one of the present generation to disseminate and defend Old Testament science, through the one-volume Commentary that bears his name and through a number of popular publications. He had an unusually wide knowledge of the literature, and an eminently sane judgment in his use of it.

7. A good many items would have to be added to the foregoing, if the important work of living scholars were included. But even with this in mind, we must freely admit the limitations and dependence on German scholarship of the British contribution to Old Testament science. Whilst the scholarship of the seventeenth century had nothing of which to be ashamed, the contribution of the eighteenth century was small, and that of the nineteenth lagged far behind the rapidly advancing German work. Our scientific exegesis has been largely, though by no means wholly, dependent on German leadership, as Vollrath rightly points out in his interesting review of our contribution. On the other hand, we can claim certain qualities in what we have done which have been markedly absent in a good deal of the German work. There has been with us throughout a strong religious interest. If this has sometimes been a drag on the wheels of progress, the steadying influence has also been salutary. Science must have its full freedom to be science at all; but there are values which lie beyond and above the horizon of science—in this case, the highest values of human life. After all, the enormous amount of patient skill which has been lavished on the Old Testament, in contrast with the relatively scanty measure dealt out to most Oriental books, is due to the fact that *this* book holds a unique place, and that it is integrally bound up with the fortunes, and indeed with the truth, of Christianity

---

[1] The philological basis of all Gray's work is as sound as Driver's: the pupil passes beyond the teacher in the use of data drawn from the comparative study of religion.

itself It is not too much to say that Christianity stands or falls with the ultimate truth of the prophetic consciousness of Israel; the special interest of British scholars in the phenomena of prophecy is in this respect significant. This religious interest is the true explanation of much that would seem to be merely obscurantism or entrenched conservatism in the history of the science in Great Britain. If we have been slow to follow where others led, it is partly because we realized, better than they, the magnitude of the issues involved. We shall never be satisfied to leave the Old Testament to the scholar pure and simple.[1] We ask for more in a commentary than would appeal to him, and we ask for less of what is of merely academic interest, such as the majority of the textual emendations of some commentaries of to-day. There are numerous signs that post-war Germany is growingly conscious of the truth of this religious emphasis; recent German work is more human and less purely technical in its treatment of the Old Testament. The ideals of scholarship which have animated our best workers, no less than those of the Continent, must not be relaxed. There is still plenty of work to be done on this side—notably a Hebrew syntax written on the basis of comparative study of the Semitic languages. But there are other directions in which there is less demand for philological technique—a competent handbook of archæology, a commentary on the Psalms more on the lines of Kittel than of Gunkel, a history of Israel which shall deal adequately with the documents, and relate the facts to the whole setting of world-history, and a whole series of special studies in Old Testament theology, showing the genetic relation to New Testament doctrine. Much of this work is peculiarly related to our national interests and capacities, but all of it requires a higher standard of thoroughness than most of us have yet attained.

---

[1] There seems to be nothing in German to correspond with our *Century* and *Cambridge Bibles.*

Literature.

CHRIST AND CHRISTIANITY.

Professor John Baillie, M.A., D.Litt., of Toronto, has followed his 'Interpretation of Religion' by *The Place of Jesus Christ in Modern Christianity* (T. & T. Clark; 7s. net), a book which has been received with a chorus of praise from all sides. It is certainly a very able book, and will bring reassurance to doubting minds. It is difficult to resist the charm of a mind which is perfectly sincere, intensely in earnest, and at the same time fresh and original. All these qualities are to be found here. Dr. Baillie starts from the foundation and expounds what he regards as the Christian message, a message of love in man to man and in God to man, a love that is redemptive, self-sacrificing, and triumphant.

From this he passes to consider the place of Christ in the Christian scheme. His discussion ranges round the two focal ideas of Incarnation and Atonement, and he boldly faces the question: What do we mean by them? It seems evident that what he means to get at is the essential spiritual reality behind such terms. And there can be no question about his success in this task. That is the value of his book, a great value. But whether he does not leave something behind in his progress is another question. The indwelling Christ, the indwelling Spirit, and the indwelling God may not mean the same thing, but they point to the same experience; that is the burden of much that he says, and he does not go further. Does his view of the Incarnation differ in any vital aspect from a spiritual unitarianism? It hardly seems so. 'Here, then,' he says, 'the necessary clarification seems to have been made. Jesus Christ is not another name for God, but the name of a Man in whom God was and through whom God came to meet us.' Or this: 'We wonder, again, whether we are prepared to say that God's presence in Christ was so wholly different in principle from His presence in other human hearts as this clear-cut distinction between the persons of the Son and the Spirit seems to make it.' These are perhaps examples of an effort to make the Christian message real and acceptable to modern minds. But do they conserve what the Catholic doctrine of Incarnation asserts?

It would be ungrateful to dwell on this aspect of Professor Baillie's book. It is a book for which we are much in his debt. And certainly to perplexed minds it will bring light and comfort which perhaps other presentations would not afford.

ISAIAH.

The Rev. Charles Boutflower, M.A., has subjected *The Book of Isaiah, Chapters I.–XXXIX.* (S.P.C.K.; 16s. net), to a full and fresh examination in the light of the Assyrian monuments, and his studies have led him to the conclusion that practically this whole section falls within the period of Isaiah, and comes from Isaiah himself. Even chs. 24–27, which are now pretty generally assigned to the fourth century, constitute no exception: he finds ‘in these chapters the prophetic dreamings of the prophet Isaiah in his old age,’ and the Resurrection doctrine implicit in 26^{19} may well be his. The conservative spirit which governs the discussion comes out in his comment on 25^{6}: the ‘feast of fat things’ of which the prophet speaks is the Gospel Supper. ‘With the New Testament in our hands how easily can we see what it all means! At Jerusalem will be offered the Great Sacrifice for the sins of the whole world.’ It is also evident in his reference to ‘the primæval promise made to our first parents of the coming Conqueror of Death,’ and in his ascription of Ps 16 to David. Similarly, though with rather more reason, Pss 46, 48, and 76 are regarded as ‘poetic descriptions of the Assyrian's overthrow,’ and—with less reason—‘Ps 87 may very well be referred to the occasion of the deliverance of Jerusalem from the arms of Sennacherib.’ The great vision of Is 19^{23-25} with its ‘highway out of Egypt to Assyria’ is held to point forward to Darius, who constructed roads throughout his vast empire.

This being Mr. Boutflower's general outlook, it is no surprise that to him the tyrant in Is 14 is Tiglathpileser, for there were ‘Chaldeans before the time of Nebuchadnezzar, and Medes before the days of Cyrus,’ and in an inscription of 729 B.C. he is actually called the king of Babylon. The book contains many challenges of current critical opinion: for example, Isaiah was called in 736 B.C.; Immanuel is the prophet's son by his second wife, and probably he was taken while still a young lad to live in the northern kingdom by his father (7^{15}), who ‘sought for safety by withdrawing beyond the dominions of Ahaz.’ But whether the reader agrees or not with these suggestions, or with Mr. Boutflower's view of the Isaianic authorship and historical background of this portion of the book, he will find here, carefully collected from authentic sources, an immense amount of valuable information touching the international situation in the latter half of the eighth century B.C.

A NEW SERIES.

A series of volumes on ‘The Christian Religion, its Origin and Progress,’ has been projected under the general editorial supervision of Dr. J. F. Bethune-Baker, the Lady Margaret's Professor of Divinity in the University of Cambridge. The first volume has been issued, and deals with *The Rise of the Christian Church* (Cambridge: The University Press; 7s. 6d. net). Other volumes will follow on ‘The Expansion of the Church’ and ‘The Church of To-day.’ The present volume is in three parts—‘The Jewish People and their Faith,’ by the Rev. L. Elliott Binns, D.D.; ‘The Earliest Christian Church,’ by the Ven. J. W. Hunkin, B.D., O.B.E., M.C.; and ‘Early Traditions about Jesus,’ by the General Editor. The idea of this division is that we should first of all see the roots out of which the Christian religion grew; then we should see that religion at work, its beliefs and practices, as soon as we have detailed evidence about it; and, finally, we should hear of the traditions about the Founder which were current in the society in the early years of its existence. The series is meant not only for the general reader, but for older pupils in secondary schools. This has been kept steadily in view only, we fear, by the General Editor. Even senior pupils will find some portions of the two first parts fairly stiff reading. The general point of view is decidedly modernist, and this applies particularly to the third part, in which the ‘liberal’ standpoint is quite emphatically prominent. The miraculous is for the most part eliminated; the Resurrection of Christ is interpreted as a spiritual communication to the disciples; the Virgin Birth is also set aside, though the case for it is fairly stated; Jesus did not institute a Supper that was to be observed permanently; and the passage in Matthew about the foundation of the Church ‘is generally believed to represent a tradition that originated at a later time.’

On a general review of the whole book, one is impressed with its ability, the competence of its writers and the clear fashion in which their results are stated. The second part, by Archdeacon Hunkin, is extraordinarily good, vivid and illuminating as a picture of early Christianity and its beliefs, and of the way of living of the society at the beginning. The part dealing with the story of the Jewish people is also well done. But there are curious statements and omissions which we should like to see justified. Among these are the following: The people in the time of Moses were a confederacy of tribes; it was the priesthood that made Judaism the religion of a book; there is no mention of the *rise* of the Scribes; the Samaritans were really a sect of orthodox Jews, though they no doubt 'included among them people of mixed descent'; the Wisdom literature seems to have appeared first in the Exile period; very few exiles returned at the Restoration; Ezra is not an historical person. The last statement gives us a jolt, but some of the others are nearly as surprising. Was it not the Scribes who made Judaism a book-religion? May not certain elements in the Wisdom literature have begun about the time of Solomon, when wider ideas came into the peoples' life? Is not the origin of the Samaritans to be traced to the influx of Assyrian colonists after the fall of the northern kingdom? Dr. Binns has made one serious omission in his list of recommended books. No mention is made of Sir G. A. Smith's 'Historical Geography of the Holy Land,' the best and most indispensable of all books on the subject.

If the series goes on as it has begun it will be an invaluable guide to the rise and progress of the Christian religion. There are points on which strong disagreement will be felt by many readers, especially in regard to the 'modernist' attitude on New Testament problems. But this first volume is an excellent piece of work, and no one can read it without refreshment and enlightenment.

THE RESURRECTION.

Messrs. T. & T. Clark have commenced a fifth series of 'The Scholar as Preacher,' with a volume of sermons by the Ven. Archdeacon Charles entitled *The Resurrection of Man, and Other Sermons* (7s. 6d. net). There are in all twenty-two sermons, which, with one exception, were preached in Westminster Abbey. Our readers will recollect that we quoted last month from the sermon on 'Loving God with the Mind.' It is interesting to note that the twelfth sermon, on 'God's Commission to the Prophet,' was preached at the consecration of Dr. Barnes as Bishop of Birmingham. The main interest of the volume, however, will be found in the first nine sermons, which deal with the resurrection and the future life. The subject is controversial, and the preacher does not 'hope to secure the acceptance of his teaching in Tennessee or Rome.' There are many, however, who swear neither by Rome nor by Tennessee who will take objection to some of the positions maintained, and who will perhaps demur to the tone of assurance with which the Archdeacon dismisses some doctrines which the Christian Church has held to be of the essence of the faith. Dr. Charles has evidently a strong aversion to what he is pleased to call 'gross physical miracles,' among which he classes the bodily resurrection of Jesus. One may venture to ask, 'Why call the physical "gross"? Is the physical world not God's world? Did not the Son of God come in the flesh? Was His flesh gross?' One may take leave to hope that the newer physical science, if nothing else, will presently dispel this false spirituality which sniffs at matter and in effect denies that God's world is one. Probably Karl Barth is right when he says that 'some day people will smile at the pictures of Jesus which we have made acceptable to the cultured by purging them of miracle, even more than our eighteenth and nineteenth centuries have smiled at the miracle stories.' We gratefully acknowledge, however, that Dr. Charles in these sermons has written much to confirm our faith in the blessed life to come, much that is fitted to enlighten, comfort, and invigorate his readers.

THE LOST BOOK OF THE NATIVITY OF JOHN.

It is well known that numerous Apocryphal writings have gathered round the life story of John the Baptist. This is due, as in the case of all Apocryphal productions, to the fact that the writers were tinged with the peculiar strain and environment of their time, and made an effort in their own way to fill up any supposed deficit in John's history, thus completing the story imperfectly told in the Gospels. Inquiring spirits naturally turned from Jesus and His mother to look for further information as to His great Forerunner, and the writers of the age had little difficulty in supplying it. An instance of this is seen in the 'Life of John the Baptist' which was composed by Serapion, an Egyptian bishop, *c.* A.D. 385–395, and which was recently published by Mingana.

The Apocryphal stories relating to the birth of John, in which he figures as the infant Messiah, and some of which run parallel to the gospel stories of the birth of Jesus, have been gathered and discussed by Mr. Hugh J. Schonfield in *The Lost 'Book of the Nativity of John'* (T. & T. Clark; 5s. net). From the large body of material which the author has collected, covering many centuries, he concludes that there must have been an Infancy Gospel of

John, in his character as Messiah, in existence in early times, even before the gospel stories of Jesus' birth were written. Some parts of this lost book, he holds, formed the basis of these stories, and were incorporated by Luke into his account of the birth of Jesus. This was the case with such incidents as the Divine Annunciation, the visit of the Magi, the enraged king, the massacre of the infants, and the providential escape. The author believes that the Early Church had reasons for suppressing the book, but he gives us what he regards as a 'conjectural restoration' of it. On such grounds he would delete from the Gospels the stories setting forth the Virgin Birth of Jesus and similar events according to the current Messianic conceptions, especially as these are a stumbling-block to the faith of many Christians, and would begin the history of Jesus with His being anointed to preach the gospel. All such stories, whether of John or of Jesus, he regards as either echoes of Israel's ancient heroes, or prophetic and apocalyptic conceptions historicised.

The volume is full of interest, but it is doubtful whether the author's standpoint will commend itself to the majority of Biblical scholars. Can the Apocryphal writings referred to be taken as proof of the existence of a book on the nativity of John? Many will regard the evidence on this point as insufficient. Even though it were otherwise, can it be said that such a book antedates the gospel stories of the birth of Jesus? This last is really the crucial point, and if the answer be in the negative, the argument practically fails. The *Protevangelium*, which is one of the earliest evidences quoted by the author, embodies in its present form the result of a Gnostic recast, and can hardly be dated earlier than the latter part of the third century. It cannot be placed, as the author does, in the second century on the doubtful ground that Justin Martyr 'has several verbal and incidental agreements with it.' Naturally, some of the material in such Apocryphal writings may be much older than the date of the writings themselves, but it would be difficult to find in any of the material quoted by the author sufficient proof that there were written stories of John's nativity in existence, identical with those connected with Jesus, before the first appearance of the Gospels. The Apocryphal stories of John's life seem rather to be the later creations of mythopœic fancy arising from the desire to fill in what might seem to be deficiencies in his history. Compare the story of Salome falling through the ice, and thus having her head cut off—a legend which arose from a sense that justice had not been satisfied so long as Herodias and her daughter were allowed to go free. On the other hand, the gospel narrative was set down under entirely different conditions. It is enshrined in documents known to be near in date to the facts, and in which the line of connexion between the record and the fact is still traceable. The same reasoning as the author adopts would overthrow much of genuine history. Primitive ideas, compounded of ignorance, imagination, and superstition, and the evidence of folk-lore, would be sufficient to discredit many historical facts.

The argument of the volume, however, is worthy of all consideration. It puts John in a high position, similar to that attributed to him in M. Goguel's recent book, 'Au seuil de l'Évangile, Jean-Baptiste.' Those who feel inclined to accept the argument do well to remember that, even though the stories of the Virgin Birth, the Magi, and the other incidents are eliminated from the history of Jesus, nothing of vital consequence to our faith is lost, and His birth, as the author says, would still be a 'virgin' one; for He was born of the Virgin daughter of Zion, of the spiritual travail of His people.

THE NATURE OF THE ATONEMENT.

The Atonement in History and in Life (S.P.C.K.; 10s. 6d. net) is another of those composite studies in theology which are a growing feature of our time. It arose from the dissatisfaction felt by a group of friends that the Anselmian view of the Atonement has been so largely discountenanced in Anglican circles in recent years in favour of theories of the 'subjective' type. (This may doubtless be traced in no small measure to the influence of the late Dr. Rashdall's important and impressive monograph on this doctrine.) Accordingly, the contributors to the volume under review are of the common conviction that there is at least some core of truth in the traditional 'objective' theory, as set forth by Anselm and endorsed, with variations, by his successors among the theologians in the Scholastic and Reformation periods.

The introduction, by the editor, the Rev. L. W. Grensted, M.A., B.D., indicates and sometimes fills up certain obvious gaps in the discussion as a whole. It appears also to show in what sense the difference between objective and subjective theories is viewed. It looks as though in subjective theories, according to this volume, the Cross is no more than a revelation of God's love in history and its influence the moral influence of a high example of self-devotion; whereas in the objective theories the happenings at the Cross pass beyond the limits of history, speaking to us of something wrought by God, namely, the forgiveness of sins. For the experience of forgiveness does not find its explanation within experience, as merely a change in the human heart, but points to a doctrine of God wherein Atonement is seen to be an inner necessity of His Being. In short, 'Christ did something for us which had to be done, and which we could not do for ourselves.'

Three essays on Old Testament and Jewish Theology in this context of Atonement theory are followed by three on the Atonement in the Synoptic Gospels, the Pauline Epistles, and the Johannine writings respectively. Then come four essays on the Atonement in the Patristic writings, in Anselm, in Reformation Theology, and in Post-Reformation Writers. The last is disappointing, and it might readily have been very useful. Dr. D'Arcy then contributes a study on the Atonement and the Problem of Evil, an interesting and characteristic essay, but somewhat divergent from the central thought and standpoint of the volume. Also interesting and suggestive is the one that follows, by Mr. Grensted, on the Atonement in Personal Experience. The penultimate essay, by Mr. Shebbeare, deals with the Atonement and Modern Thought, and contains a timely exposition of certain views of Karl Barth.

A study on the Preaching of the Cross, strongly 'evangelical' in tone, brings to a close a volume of essays unequal in merit, unco-ordinated in style and treatment, but, on the whole, worthy of a place on the shelves of the theologian and preacher.

SOCIAL CHRISTIANITY.

Social Christianity in England: A Study in its Origin and Nature, by J. F. Laun (S.C.M.; 4s. 6d. net), is a book of uncommon interest because of its origin. Herr Laun is a German who fought against us in the War, and was an ardent nationalist. After the War he was invited to Woodbrooke College, where he made many friends, and to the 'Copec' Conference, where he became a Pacifist. Later he lectured in Germany on English Social Christianity, and wrote a book on the subject. Once again he returned to England on a Rockefeller foundation, and studied at Balliol College, where he worked hard at the subject on which he has now written a new book.

He is an optimist as well as a pacifist, and finds ground for hope about the future in the many movements that are arising—Youth Movement, Women's Movement, Labour Movement, and Peace Movement. He is deeply convinced that only real Christianity can conquer the selfishness in such forces as Nationalism, Militarism, Materialism, Capitalism, and even Labourism. And in this connexion he makes the suggestive remark, that the Churches can only further the unifying influences in the world 'by promoting their own reunion.'

In no country has Christianity assumed a social character so deeply as in England, and Herr Laun proceeds to trace the roots out of which this has sprung. And so he gives us a history of the Christian Social Movement from the point of view of an impartial outsider. It is very well done, even if sometimes the view is not what we ourselves would take. The Archbishop of York, in a cordial foreword, makes the suggestive remark that the deepest influence in English religion is that of Plato, and not (as the writer of the book suggests) that of the great continental reformers. But that is one item only, and the Archbishop warmly praises the book, both for its freshness and its thoroughness.

CHURCH DISCIPLINE IN SCOTLAND.

A book that is both learned and interesting on a live and important subject has been written by the Rev. Ivo Macnaughton Clark, B.D., Ph.D.—*A History of Church Discipline in Scotland* (W. & W. Lindsay, Aberdeen; 7s. net). Dr. Clark deals with the New Testament authority for discipline first of all, and then traces the development of Church discipline from the Celtic period in Scotland, through the Roman supremacy, to the present day. Most of his chapters are concerned with the period of the Reformed Church, and the books of discipline receive careful elucidation. So does the gradual decay of Church discipline, with its causes and results. Strictness in regard to doctrine has declined, as we see from the absence of 'heresy hunts.' And strictness in regard to morals has declined, as compared with earlier days, as we see from the actual practice in cases of moral offenders. What effect will the Union of the two great Presbyterian Churches have on discipline? It ought to tighten up the cords of at least moral discipline. But this, and indeed the whole relation of the Church to this subject, will depend on the answers the Church leaders are prepared to find to certain questions.

One of these is: What is the idea of the Church that is behind discipline? Is the Church to be a select body of saints who live up to the Christian standard? Or, is there to be an open door, and is the Church to consist of all who can call themselves Christians at whatever stage the individual may be? The Plymouth Brethren, for example, exercise a very severe discipline, because their theory is that a Christian body should be purged of all that is not of the highest standard. Which idea of the Church is to be the guiding light in this matter?

Another question of importance is the test of faithful Christian living. Is, for example, attendance at the Lord's Supper to be the test? In Scotland it largely is so. Attendance at the sacrament is compulsory. Failing that, a member is removed from the roll of membership. This at the very least raises an extremely debatable point. And, with regard to the ministry, a similar point appears. Is the minister of a church to be dealt with for inefficiency as well as for misconduct? One of the uniting Churches in Scotland has insisted on the affirmative answer to this question; the other has not yet adopted such an attitude.

These are some of the many questions to which Dr. Clark's book supplies, or suggests, solutions. The whole subject is going to be of urgent importance in Scotland, and Dr. Clark's historical survey has come at a very opportune moment.

BOOKS OF DEVOTION.

Books of Devotion, when they are really good, are a great boon, alike to preacher and ordinary worshipper. And we have three to mention that can be wholly commended. One is *A Quiet Room: A Book of Prayers and Offices*, compiled by the Rev. R. Ambrose Reeves, B.A. (S.C.M.; 3s.). The collection arose out of a series of services which were held in a church in New York, and it is wisely and reverently made. There is nothing vulgar or even conventional in the prayers, though perhaps it may be questioned whether one or two of them could be used easily. There are five divisions under which intercessions are arranged—General, the Church, a Parish, the Holy Eucharist, and a Day of Prayer—and the detailed arrangement of the services is admirable.

The second book is *The True Advent: Daily Meditations and Prayers from All Saints' Day to New Year's Eve*, edited by the Rev. P. T. R. Kirk (Hodder & Stoughton; 2s. 6d. net). The course covers the months of November and December, one chapter for each day. There are a meditation, a prayer, and generally a poem for every day, and the material is drawn from the most diverse sources—Browning, Wesley, Pasteur, Whittier, Coleridge, Robertson Smith, and Goethe—to take a few names at random. The book is admirably suited to its purpose in providing devotional reading for the period from All Saints' Day till the end of the year.

The third of these volumes is by the author of 'The True Advent,' and is a manual of preparation for Holy Communion, '*The Hour of the Watch*' (Stockwell). It is intended primarily for the use of candidates for confirmation, and instruction is given in the office of Holy Communion, but it is well fitted to be a companion to those who would engage in the service worthily. Chapters are devoted to 'a week of preparation,' to the day of Communion, to the Office itself, and to appropriate meditations and prayers. The full value of such a book can be gauged only by its proper use. But everything said in the course of the book seems appropriate and helpful.

ST. THOMAS AQUINAS.

The Philosophy of St. Thomas Aquinas (Heffer; 8s. 6d. net) is an authorized translation by Mr. Edward Bullough, M.A., of Professor Étienne Gilson's 'Le Thomisme.' The translation is made from the third (revised and enlarged) edition, and has been edited by the Rev. G. A. Elrington. It first appeared in 1925—the translator having access to a number of manuscript additions intended by the author for the third French edition. But when, in 1927, the third French edition appeared, it contained still further additions, and these have been incorporated in this second English edition. Accordingly, this present edition is very considerably enlarged (by more than a third). It contains, besides other insertions and some minor changes in the text and notes, two entirely new chapters, namely, ix., on 'The Corporeal World and the Efficacy of Secondary Causes,' and xiii., on 'Knowledge and Truth.'

In view of the revival among us of Thomist studies, any competent exposition of the 'Summa Theologica' would be welcome, but this volume is doubly welcome, as deriving from the hand of one who is universally recognized as a fine scholar and a masterly expositor. Indeed, M. Gilson's is one of the great names among contemporary historians of philosophy. His work on Thomism, we should add, has been fortunate in its English translator; and we are sure that in this revised and enlarged form it will win for itself still further recognition among English-speaking students of philosophy.

John Ruskin died in 1900, just thirty years ago, at the age of eighty-one. He outlived Carlyle, Browning, and Tennyson, but during the last ten years of his life his literary work had ceased, and he had lived in retirement at Brantwood, in the Lake District. He had, however, in 1899 founded at Oxford the Ruskin College for artisans 'who desire to qualify themselves for active work on behalf of their own class.' Since his death his complete works and his biography have been published, and although to-day we hear little of the man who was so prominent a personality, yet his 'Modern Painters,' 'Stones of Venice,' his letters to the working men of England under the title 'Fors Clavigera' hold their place among the classics of English literature. Under the title *The Solitary Warrior*, as he once described himself in his later years, one of his admirers, Mr. J. Howard Whitehouse, has compiled a number of his letters, none of which has previously been published, and these are issued by Messrs. George Allen & Unwin, Ltd. (7s. 6d. net). The volume has a portrait of Ruskin in middle age by his artist friend, Samuel Lawrence, and half a dozen illustrations in water colour or pencil drawings by Ruskin himself. He made the acquaintance in 1855 of the Rev. A. J. Scott, a Manchester minister who had asked him to lecture in that town, and many of these letters are written to him or to one of his daughters, with whom he formed an intimate friendship. But the special interest of the book is that it deals with the story of Ruskin's attachment to Miss Rose la Touche, whom he first met as a child of nine, whose education and development he watched over, and to whom he afterwards proposed marriage. The proposal, however, was resisted by her parents, and her death at an early age was a never forgotten tragedy in his life. 'At times his mind lost its serenity under the strain of his sorrow.' It is true that Ruskin reveals himself in these letters in the most intimate way, yet it is only in brief form, and they do not in themselves justify the claim that he is among the great letter writers. His claim to fame rests securely on his writings and it is outstanding.

A series of whimsical essays has been reissued under the title *If Wishes were Horses*, by Mr. H. W. Fowler (Allen & Unwin; 6s. net). It was originally published anonymously with the title 'Si Mihi——!' and two of the reviews of this original edition were as follows: 'Egomet has a cultured mind, a pleasing wit, and a dainty fancy,' 'He is merely shallow, and—oh! so banal and trite.' Something between the two extremes would serve for this new issue. There is a good deal of self-conscious humility, but there is also real wit and real thought, with a pleasing inconsequent style. The essays are quite charming, and, if they do not reach the level of Lamb or Hazlitt, there is something of the old essayists to be found in them. One thing is interesting: the author has an entirely unreligious nature. He regards religion not only as untrue but as an absurdity, and does not even wish it were true. This is so rare a phenomenon as to be quite engrossing. Perhaps his contemptuous words about religion account for previous anonymity. And this suggests a title for an additional essay. To the various chapters, 'If I had' this and that, might be added 'If I had courage.'

The Church Missionary Society knows not only how to evangelize, but also how to advertise. *The Search* (C.M.S.; 1s.) is the story of the Society's work for the year 1928–29. Swiftly and graphically the survey passes from field to field—Africa, the Near East, India, China, Japan—and brings before the reader the most telling incidents and salient points. It is a picture of brightness flecked with shadow, which, while it calls for thankfulness, leaves a deep impression of the immensity of the task.

The Missionary's Job, by Mr. Godfrey Phillips (Edinburgh House Press; 1s. net), contains a series of short talks on missionary problems with special reference to India. The style is vigorous, colloquial, and picturesque. Though brief, it is an admirable apologia for missions, just the very thing to put into the hands of the man in the street who can see no good in them.

The Unseen Reality (Epworth Press; 1s. net) consists of Seven Studies in the Epistle to the Hebrews by the Rev. A. Gordon James. The papers are thoughtful, devotional in tone, and simply written. But loose remarks like the following want revision in the light of a more exact estimate of the function of theology: 'As a rule, the intellectual illumination of the Cross essayed by scholars seems only to increase the darkness.'

We have already several well-known works containing specimens of the New Testament codices, but an excellent one has recently been issued in Germany—*Codicum Novi Testamenti Specimina* (P. Hanstein, Bonn; M.16), by Professor Henr. Jos. Vogels, S.Th.D., of the University of Bonn. The volume gives beautiful phototype reproductions from fifty-one different codices, together with three specimens from ancient printed Bibles (including *Biblia Thirty-six linearum*, of date *c.* A.D. 1460). The book has been published not so much for paleographic purposes as to aid students and others in their reading of New Testament manuscripts; and for this reason a whole page from each codex is given, including any emendations, subscriptions, comments, annotations, or other additions which the page contains. The value of the book lies not merely in this but also in the fact that most of the specimens are here reproduced for the first time. The general opinion as to the early Christian codices is that they are unornamental productions, roughly written; but an examination of these phototype pages shows a wonderful beauty and perfection of the calligrapher's art. In a 'Tabularum Conspectus' Dr. Vogels gives a brief description in Latin of each of the fifty-four sources from which he has taken the specimens. The book should prove of use to Biblical students in their class-work, and to all interested in the early manuscripts of the New Testament.

The Inspiration of the Bible (Herder; 3s. 6d. net) comes from the practised pen of the Rev. John A. McClorey, S.J., who in the name of the Church reads the handwriting upon the wall for Modernism, 'the latest Balthasar.' No doubt Modernism, as he would define it, is a menace to the Church, and may be regarded as in some measure responsible for the social evils he finds rampant in the United States of America; but *post hoc* is not necessarily *propter hoc*, and we think that the influence of Modernism has been here much exaggerated. None the less this is a very good sample of Roman Catholic apologetic for the Bible, and it is refreshing and reassuring to read even such words as these: 'It is permissible for a Catholic to believe that the waters of the Red Sea did not part for the Israelites. A wind blew the water of the sea back a distance from the shore; the Israelites passed dry shod and the waters returned to their place in time to drown the Egyptians.' Being allowed to take liberties of this sort with the Biblical text, the Catholic believer is free to interpret as 'stylistic ornaments' or otherwise what the Protestant Fundamentalist is always bound to take as Biblical fact. So this writer holds; and in examining his Church's views on the Canonicity, the Inspiration, the Infallibility, and the Insufficiency of the Bible (as requiring a living interpreter), he takes frequent occasion to dissociate his Church from Fundamentalism. His attitude to the question of ecclesiastical authority seems to be well reflected in the utterance, 'Oh, it is hard to be a Catholic, but it is satisfying and safe.'

The Christian God, by the Rev. Richard Roberts, D.D. (Hodder & Stoughton; 6s. net), contains the Merrick Lectures delivered at Ohio Wesleyan University in December 1928. There are six lectures, and they form a popular and up-to-date apology for the Christian faith. Beginning with the fact of prayer as a reaching out of the soul towards the Divine, the writer goes on to treat of 'the Christian event' and its implications with regard to God and Christ. Thereafter there follows a discussion of human disharmony and Divine atonement. The subjects are treated with great freshness and lucidity, while there are evidences throughout that the writer is in touch with the most recent literature.

In *Problems of Providence* (Longmans; 4s. net), a new volume of 'The Anglican Library of Faith and Thought,' the Rev. Charles J. Shebbeare, M.A., sets himself to show that, while popular theism is consistent with physical science, an Immanentist or Hegelian theism avoids some of the difficulties of the other, without necessarily depriving religion of the God with whom man can enter into communion and fellowship. He traverses a wide field with great, and indeed sometimes breathless, rapidity. The little volume is packed full of ideas, and rich in reference and allusion to literature both ancient and modern. It is written in a popular style, is informative as to recent movements in science and religious philosophy, and shows that acuteness of mind and progressive spirit, combined with an essential conservatism, which we had learned to expect of the author of 'The Challenge of the Universe.' In that work Mr. Shebbeare offers a modern apologia for teleology in the physical universe, in this for teleology in human life and history.

Economic Causes of the Reformation in England, by Professor Oscar A. Marti, Ph.D. (Macmillan; 10s. 6d. net), is a very careful and scholarly work.

In it the author traces the methods of Papal finance which by the fourteenth century had laid an intolerable burden upon the material resources of England. Thereafter he deals with the economic causes, and particularly the rise of the new commercial order, which led in the end to the disendowment of the English clergy and the secularization of Church property. The religious side of the movement is barely touched on, and this may seem to give an unbalanced picture. The writer, however, would doubtless argue that the picture, as usually painted, throws the religious aspect into high relief and needs this emphasizing of economic causes to restore the balance. The story of papal extortions is generally familiar to the student of history, but here the evidence is set forth in great detail in a calm and impartial spirit, and is supported by ample quotations from contemporary sources. It is an overwhelming indictment, and goes far to account not only for the upheaval of the sixteenth century, but also for the Englishman's traditional dislike of foreigners. Professor Marti leads us to the *fontes*, of which he has made an exhaustive study, and he has added to the value of his work by very full references and an excellent bibliography.

In *The Annual of the American Schools of Oriental Research*, vol. ix. for 1927–28 (Milford; 21s. net), we have two interesting chapters on archæological work in the Near East. The first of these is a short account by Professor Elihu Grant, of Haverford College, of the excavations carried out by him at Beth Shemesh (*Rumeileh*, near *Artuf* station) in 1928. In 1911–12, Mackenzie excavated about one-fifth of the ruins, running exploratory trenches from the south gate northward, and finding among other things valuable rock-cut tombs of the Israelite period. Professor Grant's excavations have revealed material remains of every century from 2000 to 700 B.C., with indications of five successive occupations, and traces also of an early bronze age population. The second chapter, much longer, is a detailed account of the excavations at Tepe Gawra ('The Great Mound'), north-east of Mosul, in Iraq, by E. A. Speiser, of the University of Pennsylvania. These have revealed, among numerous other finds, a large quantity of painted pottery, and the account revolves largely around this special type of ware, which extends, it is believed, from Thessaly to Manchuria, and which has been shown to be characteristic of the neolithic and chalcolithic eras in that part of the world. According to the account, the earliest observable movement brings this painted ware culture from the northern highlands, in which it most likely originated, down to the head of the Persian Gulf. Both chapters are profusely illustrated, and are worth careful study by all interested in the archæology of the Near East.

To the 'Every Teacher's Library,' which already boasts a number of excellent handbooks, has been added *Sex Teaching*, by the Rev. A. Herbert Gray, D.D. (National Sunday School Union; 2s. 6d. net). Dr. Gray has made this subject his own, and in this new contribution to its furtherance he has on the whole made out a case for the urgency of sex teaching. With almost all he says about the evils of ignorance there will be a large measure of agreement, and with his contention that parents should enlighten their children there will be almost entire agreement. But when it is contended that Sunday-school teachers should give such teaching we fancy there may be a considerable disagreement. However, a great deal of sound and sane advice is given here on the whole subject, as well as on marriage and its responsibilities, and the book will do good on its own lines.

Any work which makes the Bible more intelligible or interesting is welcome, and therefore a word of commendation is due to *The Eastern Colour of the Bible*, by the Rev. G. H. Scherer, M.A., S.T.M. (National Sunday School Union; 2s. 6d. net). It is the fifteenth volume of the 'Every Teacher's Library,' and it is one of the best. The author realizes that the Bible is an Oriental book, and that it needs to be read in an Oriental setting. And we have here much information about Oriental habits, about climate, trades, food, dress, houses, social life, and all the rest. There is a constant reference to Scripture. The subjects are well divided, but in another edition we would urge the author to have an exhaustive index of Scripture passages. This would add value to a book that is already full of helpfulness.

The Harmony of the Four Gospels (R.T.S.; 3s. 6d. net), by Dr. Benjamin Davies, has been revised and re-issued by Dr. S. G. Green. It is presented in the words of the Authorized Version, and follows the 'Harmony' in Greek, by Dr. Edward Robinson. There are useful explanatory notes, and many references to parallel and illustrative passages. Of course there will be differences of opinion as to the success of the harmonizing effort even in the case of the Synoptic Gospels, while modern students of the Fourth Gospel will for the most part consider it a bold undertaking to include its material along with the material of the Synoptists in a single unitary scheme.

The Appeal of Christ to the Indian, edited by E. T. Dixon and G. E. Outram (R.T.S.), is a little book of quite peculiar interest. It consists of 'selected answers from two hundred and thirty-six replies of Hindu converts to questions sent out by the Conference of Missionaries in North India. These answers tell how they became Christians, and give their opinions as to the best way of reaching non-Christians.' There are, in all, twelve narratives, each one of deep human interest, and with all the marks of genuineness and individuality. At the end of the book a pretty full summary is given of all the answers received to the *questionnaire*, and these answers throw valuable light on the problem of how best to present Christ to the Hindu mind.

We are accustomed to think of the Holy Land as a land 'flowing with milk and honey,' a land of the fruitful vine and fig tree, where the Mount of Olives stands sentinel over Jerusalem. But there is another picture suggested by the assurance that it is a land 'where the wild flowers are a daily and hourly joy' and that 'you scarce can see the grass for flowers.' That this is actual fact and not merely poetic licence is demonstrated by Augusta A. Temple in a beautifully illustrated little volume entitled *Flowers and Trees of Palestine*, published by the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge (6s. net). Spring is pre-eminently the time for flowers in Palestine, and from the middle of March until a month later they are to be found in wonderful profusion and perfection. The trees of Palestine also range from Alpine to tropical species. 'Most of those mentioned in the Bible are still to be found, though some are scarce.' The vine is very abundant and fruitful, and in the same districts as those mentioned in the Bible. 'The hills about Jezreel, where was Naboth's vineyard, are still celebrated for their vines, and in the Valley of Eshcol may be seen to this day the great "clusters of grapes."' The authoress has devoted one hundred and fourteen pages of her book to an alphabetical descriptive list of the flowers and trees, and there are twenty-nine coloured and perfect illustrations of the more beautiful flowers. This is an admirable addition to the Society's list of books on the Holy Land.

The Rev. R. B. Tollinton, D.D., Canon of Chelmsford, who is already known for his two volumes on Clement of Alexandria, has issued *Selections from the Commentaries and Homilies of Origen* (S.P.C.K.; 10s. net). The fact that it is ten years since the book was written accounts for the lack of any reference to the recent works of Harnack and De Faye, but in all other respects the study of the subject is up to date. The author provides the reader who has no time for the study of the original with an English translation of several portions of Origen's writings, especially those which retain their interest under the changed conditions of modern times. The translations are mostly from the text of the Berlin edition, where that is available, otherwise from that of Lommatzsch. The book contains an excellent introduction of forty pages, in which among other points there is a discussion of the grounds on which Origen justified allegory, and how far we must commend or criticise him for his abundant use of it. His limitations are admitted, together with the fact that he misconceived the method of inspiration, but insistence is laid on his humility and his high ideals of the teacher's office. The translated passages, which number one hundred, deal with almost every aspect of theology and life. Our religion owes not a little to Origen. Though he was a man of his own time, there is much in his teaching of abiding value, and a study of these selected writings may be of assistance towards the solution of some of our present-day problems. For these and other reasons, Dr. Tollinton's book is a useful adjunct to every preacher's library.

In *The Bishop's Register* (S.P.C.K.; 12s. 6d. net), with introduction and notes, by the Rev. Clifford J. Offer, M.A., Vicar of Highmore, Oxon., we have a translation of documents from mediæval episcopal registers. The documents have been chosen for the purpose not only of illustrating their contents, but of exhibiting various phases of mediæval episcopal activity. Every bishop had to keep some record of his activities; hence arose the rolls or registers. These have not all been preserved, but the book contains several going back to the thirteenth century. There are over eighty given altogether, dealing with religious life, administrative and parochial affairs, and miscellaneous matters. In the introduction the author gives an account of the origin of the various orders to which the different mediæval monasteries belonged, as well as a description of their internal economy and management. The documents tend to support the view that the general standard of discipline varied considerably here and there, but that after the thirteenth century there was a decline, slow but progressive. The book deserves a wide reception, and should be in the library of every one interested in English Church history. Translations of documents dealing with life in the Middle Ages have already appeared, but episcopal registers have been strangely neglected, and this volume supplies the want.

In *English Religious Life in the Eighth Century*, by Mr. Thomas Allison, M.A. (S.P.C.K.; 5s. net), an endeavour is made to give a picture of the period drawn from contemporary letters. One could have wished that the writer had quoted more fully from the letters themselves, instead of summarizing as he has done. But he has succeeded in throwing many illuminating sidelights on the religious, political, and social life of the age. The book gives evidence of wide and thorough study of the original authorities, and there is ample material to confirm the judgment of the writer that 'the general impression made by a study of these letters will probably be, that, although there are very many dark spots in the picture of English religious life in the eighth century, yet the picture is by no means one of unrelieved gloom.'

The Rest that Remaineth (Stockwell; 2s. 6d. net) is a Study in the Epistle to the Hebrews by the Rev. W. F. Pelton, M.A., who rearranges the order of the material of the Epistle with a view to bringing out what he regards as the cardinal truth contained in it, namely, Heavenly Rest. On the basis of the rearranged order he expounds the thought of the Epistle in quite a clear style, holding that 'the rest that remaineth' is essentially peace in adversity. But we fail to see that he has gained anything from the expositor's standpoint by all his various transferences and inversions.

A book on the question *Can I teach my Child Religion?* by Mr. George Stewart, Ph.D. (S.C.M.; 3s. net), should perhaps be entitled '*How* can I teach my child religion?' The topics dealt with are 'The Spiritual Significance of Children's Perplexities,' 'The Method of Religious Instruction in the Home,' and 'Materials for Religious Instruction available for any Home.' The book has an obvious American origin, as the bibliography, a very full one, recommends almost wholly American literature. A bibliography of English literature on the subject is, however, appended. The book itself is a sound piece of work, and will help parents who are looking for guidance. There is a tendency to think of the abnormal child all through the discussion, which lessens its value, and the advice given to parents seems to be useful largely for foolish parents. But then there are so many of these! In any case, even wise parents might read these pages not without profit.

A hundred aspirations towards peace and goodwill would seem to demand for their expression some originality. Such, however, is the content of '*Lift up your Hearts*,' by the Rev. Walter Walsh, D.D. (Williams & Norgate; 5s. net). The aspirations were uttered at the Sunday morning gatherings of the Free Religious Movement, and they contain the soaring indefiniteness which we should anticipate from their origin. But they are nobly uttered all the same. The religion behind, or in, these aspirations is of a shadowy kind to which all great 'prophets' are alike manifestations of the Supreme Being. But men of any creed may use such language as we find here, and be the better for using it.

The Logic of Religious Thought, by Mr. R. Gordon Milburn (Williams & Norgate; 6s. net), is declared in the sub-title to be 'An Answer to Professor Eddington.' The question raised by Professor Eddington is an arresting one. 'Granted that physical science has limited its scope so as to leave a background which we are at liberty to, or even invited to, fill with a reality of spiritual import . . . how are you going to deal with this domain? Have you any system of inference from mystic experience comparable to the system by which science develops a knowledge of the outside world?' Mr. Milburn's endeavour in this book is to build up a defensible system of inference based on religious facts. His line of argument is somewhat abstract, but he has many suggestive things to say bearing on the accurate observation and description of spiritual facts and the methods by which they may be empirically verified. One is, however, haunted by the suspicion that he is at times endeavouring to apply in the spiritual realm those very methods of scientific verification which Professor Eddington, speaking in the name of physical science, acknowledges to be inapplicable. The general conclusion reached is that 'religion is a lifting up of the heart and mind in adoration and self-oblation to some infinite, immeasurably exalted object,' and that it is not 'possible to have a special science of this highly specific libido-trend and its epistemological implications independently of any presuppositions as to a personal God.'

The Mind of Christ on Moral Problems of To-day.

III.

The Treatment of Crime.

By Professor John Baillie, D.Litt., Emmanuel College, Toronto.

When, at the Editors' bidding, one asks oneself what the teaching of Jesus was regarding the treatment of criminal offenders, the pure historian in one is likely at first to reply that He had no such teaching. In support of this reply we may appeal to His firm refusal to entangle Himself in the thorny political issues of His day and place, to His steady concentration of attention upon the deeper and interior issues of individual conduct, and to that other-worldliness of outlook which made Him set His heart rather on the advent of a new and Divinely inaugurated order than on the gradual improvement of our earthly social order; all of which characteristics stand out more or less clearly from the existing records. Against this, however, we have to set the fact, equally authentic in its more intangible and less easily manageable kind, that our contemporary searchings of heart concerning the ethical standing of our established methods of treating crime have seemed to those troubled by them not only to find sustenance and encouragement in certain elements of Christ's teaching and outlook on life, but even to owe their ultimate origination to the same high source.

Let us consider what these elements are. To begin with, there is that far-reaching *distrust of our natural tendency to blame* which is so striking and so very largely original a feature of our Lord's philosophy of life. 'Judge not, that ye be not judged,' He said. 'For with what judgement ye judge, ye shall be judged: and with what measure ye mete, it shall be measured to you again. And why beholdest thou the mote that is in thy brother's eye, but considerest not the beam that is in thine own eye? . . .' The insight here finding expression is that this world would be a far better and happier place if only we could learn to be one-half as alive to our neighbours' excellences as we are to our own, and one-half as blind to our neighbours' faults as we are to our own. Praise and blame have their places, but blame should begin at home and praise abroad; and only with the utmost scrupulosity and diffidence and vigilance and prayerfulness should praise be allowed to come home or blame to go abroad. Our unregenerate tendency is to refuse to be our brother's keeper, until we suspect him of naughtiness, and then we immediately make him the object of our most solicitous attention in rebuke and punishment. His good deeds are his own affair, and everything about him is his own affair—except his evil deeds, which we take to be our affair. Our brother, however, does not appear to agree. *He* is likely to be equally resentful of the little notice we take of his virtues, and of the careful attention and remarkably efficient magnifying-glass we bring to bear upon his sins. (But he is not self-consistent; he does not 'universalize his maxim,' as Kant would say; so, while resenting our treatment of him, he as habitually brings his own blind-spot to bear upon our virtues, and his own magnifying-glass to bear upon our sins.) Now, if we could reverse this unregenerate tendency and bring our magnifying-glasses to bear, not on our own virtues and our neighbours' vices, but on our own vices and our neighbours' virtues; and bring our blind-spots to bear, not on our own vices and our neighbours' virtues, but on our own virtues and our neighbours' vices: then our whole view of our neighbours, our attitude towards them and our treatment of them, would at once undergo the most revolutionary change. As things are, we are in the habit of making all sorts of allowances and excuses for our own sinnings. We put the most charitable possible interpretation upon all our own actions. We give ourselves the benefit of every doubt. We make the most of all the considerations that might make our evil deeds seem not wholly voluntary, such as hereditary bias, defective upbringing, unfortunate surroundings, abnormal psychological constitution, hard circumstances, unusual provocation, exceptional stress of temptation and the like. And withal we expend a vast deal of pity and tender solicitude and loving sorrow upon our poor bruised selves—selves not impossibly (as we at last begin to feel) 'more sinned against than sinning.' But if our natural tendency in this matter were to become reversed, then it would be *our neighbours* who, in their sinnings, would be made the objects of all this charitable interpretation and all these efforts at sympathetic understanding and all this expense of tender and sorrowing love; and this new attitude to our neighbours would be reinforced by its contrast with the new attitude which we should now be taking towards ourselves, making no allowances and putting severity in the place of self-pity. What had once looked like a cartload of timber in our brother's eye would now seem, as Jesus said, like a fleck of sawdust compared with the cartload of timber, which we now saw to be in our own, and which had formerly appeared to be only a fleck. The conclusion to be drawn is hardly that we must *never* make excuses for ourselves and *always* make them for our neighbours; for this, again, would be to fail to 'universalize our maxim.' It is rather a matter, in Aristotle's words, of attaining the mean by 'dragging ourselves towards the opposite extreme to that to which we are naturally prone, which is the method people use to straighten pieces of wood that are warped.' [1]

All these insights, then, seem to be contained in our Lord's 'Judge not.' And they are illustrated not merely by such outstanding incidents as His treatment of the woman taken in adultery, His treatment of Zacchæus and His dying prayer for the forgiveness of His own murderers, because 'they knew not what they did,' but by the whole tenor of His life. There is no more remarkable and original feature of the gospel records than the attitude taken by Jesus to the 'publicans and sinners.' The Pharisees could not see that, in behaving towards them as He did, He was not condoning sin; and they were profoundly shocked. In a parable we hear them protesting, 'As soon as this thy son was come, which hath devoured thy living with harlots, thou hast killed for him the fatted calf.' To this day it is this new-fangled attitude to sinners that seems to loyal Jews the most novel (and often the most dangerous and wrong-minded) element in our Lord's teaching. When the Pharisees (who, to be sure, were no worse than the rest of us) heard of a man who had fallen into sin, their root-feeling towards him was *blame*. But Jesus' root-feeling towards him was something much more like tender, understanding, yearning *love*. 'Let him who is without sin among you cast the first stone' is as sublimely startling a remark as has ever been addressed to our human nature.

There is one point of detail that may here be noted. The words 'that ye be not judged' have regularly been interpreted by commentators to mean 'that ye be not judged by God.' The import of the saying would thus be that God will be charitable or harsh in His judgments upon us according as we are charitable or harsh in our judgments upon our fellow-men. The saying is thus taken as giving sharper point to the beatitude, 'Blessed are the merciful; for they shall obtain mercy,' and as being closely in line with the other saying that 'If ye forgive not men their trespasses, neither will your Father forgive your trespasses.' But in reading the first five verses of the seventh chapter of St. Matthew it has never seemed to me certain that the meaning is not rather that the measure we mete out to others will in turn be meted out to ourselves *by others*. The worst of this game of judging, as we soon discover, is that two can play at it; there is always a tit for every tat; there is no end or issue to it; it involves us in a fallacious infinite regress. Jesus' central teaching with reference to God in this connexion was not that our Heavenly Father is unforgiving to the unforgiving and unsympathetic to the unsympathetic, but rather that in being forgiving and sympathetic we are being like our Heavenly Father. It was not that we must be merciful because otherwise God would be unmerciful to us, but rather that we must be merciful to others as God is merciful to us. It is conceivable that the former of these two sentiments represents a misunderstanding by His disciples of Jesus' real (and to them very unfamiliar) meaning. On the other hand, it seems in line with His own attitude to the Pharisees. The only people to whom Jesus was unmerciful were those who were themselves unmerciful to others, hence we may have to allow for a parallel element in His view of God.

Returning from these matters of detail on which no confident pronouncement is possible let us now raise a deeper question. When, following Jesus' advice, we bring sympathetic understanding and love, rather than severity and blame, to bear upon the sins of our neighbour, are we merely, for the sake of peace, allowing complacent and mannerly tolerance to interfere with our clear-eyed judgment of his real deserts, or are we attaining to *a truer view of his case*? The answer must be that we are attaining to a truer view. We are doing this, in the first place, simply because, unless we put our natural procedure into reverse gear in the way indicated above, we shall almost inevitably overestimate our neighbour's guiltiness and underestimate our own. But we must go deeper than this. The problem of guiltiness is closely bound up with the issue of free will and determinism or (in theological terms) of free will and predestination. That each pole of this antithesis stands for its own element of truth is now recognized by the large majority of competent thinkers. Our unregenerate tendency is to be determinists with regard to our own sins, but voluntarists with regard to the sins of others. We make excuses for ourselves, but others we hold fully responsible. *But we should get much nearer the truth if we reversed this.* Now one of the questions which the modern conscience has seemed so insistently to raise is whether we are reaching the whole truth about the criminal by treating him merely as a fully responsible agent. If *I* had had the same handicaps as this thief, if I had been born with the same physical and psychical inheritance, if I had endured the same upbringing and come under the same early influences, am I sure that I would not be a thief too? Nay rather, I shall echo the words, 'There, but for the grace of God, goes John Bradford!' Our modern feeling is that by assigning blame, and its natural accompaniment of punishment, to the criminal, we are scarcely scratching the surface of a problem which can be effectively tackled only by such an improvement of men's physical and spiritual surroundings as will habituate them to goodness rather than evil. Nothing is of much use—short of bringing to bear upon them the grace of God. Our highest privilege, we feel, is to be the channels through which the Divine Love may reach those bye-streets near our homes that are the breeding-places of crime in our neighbourhoods. There is not the slightest doubt that during the last few decades men have been beginning to lose their old confidence in the possibility of frightening, or coercing, or even subduing men into a law-abiding life; while, on the other hand, they have come more and more to wonder whether it may not, after all, be true that ''Η ἀγάπη οὐδέποτε πίπτει.' Now all these questionings are profoundly Christian, profoundly in line with the mind and mood of Jesus Christ—so long as only we do not allow them to carry us to an opposite extreme as one-sided as that from which we have so justly recoiled.

---

[1] *Eth. Nic.* 1109*b*.

But there is a still more significant sense in which, in bringing love and understanding to bear upon the sinner, we are taking a deeper and truer view of his case than when we bring recriminating judgment to bear upon him. We are dealing with him now, not in the light of what he actually has done or has been or now is, but in the light of what he has it in him to become and to achieve. We are basing our treatment of him on a dynamic rather than on a static view of his being. And just because he is a living, growing, changing being, the dynamic view of him is the truer one. There is always more in a man than is visible in the present state of him. That insight is always the deeper which enables us to see the latent possibilities in a man (his δύναμις, as Aristotle called it), and to judge him by these rather than by his past or present failure to realize them. That we must attribute a supreme measure of such insight to God is the deep meaning of Christ's Parables of the Lost Sheep and the Prodigal Son, as well as of much else in His teaching.

> But all, the world's coarse thumb
> And finger failed to plumb,
> So passed in making up the main account;
> All instincts immature,
> All purposes unsure,
> That weighed not as his work, yet swelled the man's amount:
>
> Thoughts hardly to be packed
> Into a narrow act,
> Fancies that broke through language and escaped;
> All I could never be,
> All, men ignored in me,
> This I was worth to God, whose wheel the pitcher shaped.[1]

To put it only a little differently, that insight is always the deeper which leads us to concentrate on the good in a man rather than on the evil, on his achievements rather than on his lapses. (A certain contemporary school of biographers please take note!) The view of him to which we are thus led is the truer one, just because goodness is always more real than evil. It is a quite essential part of the Christian teaching that goodness is the only ultimate reality and that evil is not, as Zoroastrians and Manichees and other dualists have claimed, something equally real and ultimate which exists separately in its own right (or should we say in its own wrong?) over against goodness. 'No great Christian thinker, except perhaps Kant,' writes Dr. J. H. Leckie, 'has ever maintained that evil, as an object of thought, has any positive reality.'[2] This Christian doctrine has been immensely reinforced through its complete agreement with the Platonic teaching (the ultimate identity of τὸ ἀγαθόν with τὸ ὄν being the pivotal point of all Plato's thought); but it had its own separate origin in the teaching of our Lord Himself, as will more clearly appear from the references we have yet to bring forward.

---

[1] Browning, *Rabbi Ben Ezra.*

[2] *The World to Come and Final Destiny,* p. 207.

The champions of the established order will, of course, base their defence of it on the supposed disciplinary or remedial value of punishment. To my mind, however, this claim has long been suspect, as being of the nature of a false, subsequent 'rationalization' of a practice which owes its original vogue to quite other motives. When our forefathers punished a criminal, they felt no need to persuade themselves that they were doing it for his good. On the contrary they were doing it, and they knew they were doing it, and boasted that they were doing it, for his ill. They were paying him in his own coin. They were giving him what he richly deserved. They were making good the balance of distributive justice by returning evil for his evil. If they had supposed that punishing him was going to accrue to his advantage, they would straightway have stopped punishing him. That is the good old retributive theory; and it has, at least, the qualities of sincerity and intellectual robustness. Now we have grown soft-hearted. Not soft-hearted enough seriously to interfere with our old *practice*, but soft-hearted enough to make us, while still adhering to our old practice, seek out a new and opposite reason for it. We persuade ourselves that we punish men for their own good. But the questions that are now beginning to raise their troublesome heads, and that the coming decades will almost certainly place in the forefront of ethical debate, are such as the following. Is it really so certain that punishment is an effective instrument of moral conversion? Has it even done more good than harm to our criminals? Can we *ever* do more good than harm to a man by dealing with him in the light of his past actions rather than in the light of his plastic nature and future possibilities? Can we *ever* do more good than harm to a man by concentrating on his miserable lapses rather than on the germ of goodness in him and the stirrings of the Spirit of God in his heart?

But if, on the other hand, instead of returning evil for his evil, we bring love to bear upon the evil-doer, then the tremendous Christian claim is that we unmake the evil, evaporate it out of existence or (in the Old Testament phrase) 'blot it out.' We 'overcome evil with good.' Human nature being the plastic, growing thing it is, and goodness being always more deeply rooted in reality than evil, when we judge a man in the light of his future potentialities of good, that judgment becomes itself a powerful instrument for the actualization of these potentialities. The judgment of a man in the light of what is best in him helps to make itself true, just as the judgment of a man in the light of what is worst in him helps to make itself true. This is vividly illustrated in the story of Zacchæus whom the Pharisees judged 'a man that is a sinner' and Jesus 'a son of Abraham.'

All these principles find supreme expression in the saying 'Resist not evil.' 'In this saying,' writes Dr. E. F. Scott, 'Jesus proclaimed that nothing but goodness will in the end prove itself real, and that we are safe at all times to rely upon it.' 'Jesus would thus say, "Do not oppose the devil with his own weapons." By so doing you do not defeat him, but only accept his law and make him stronger.'[1] Strangely enough, Dr. Scott, feeling the difficulty of the application of it to one's enemies as well as to criminals, suggests that the famous passage in the Sermon on the Mount (Mt $5^{38\text{ff.}}$) may be only a 'homely prudential maxim' incidentally thrown out and not central to Christ's teaching. But he comes very close to contradicting himself when he says, 'The rule of non-resistance cannot be taken as the central principle in Jesus' teaching, and may possibly be explained as little more than a prudential maxim. Nevertheless it connects itself in the closest manner with several of His fundamental ideas'—which Dr. Scott then goes on to bring out most admirably. My own feeling is that the principle of returning good for evil is but one side of the central spiritual discovery for which the whole gospel of Jesus stands—the discovery that, alike in our thought of God and in our dealings with one another, we must get beyond static justice.[2] This discovery is already reflected in the type of character selected for praise in the Beatitudes. Its application to our social relations is finely stated by Dr. Scott himself. Speaking of the gospel teaching, he says: 'The motive of justice undoubtedly tends to fall into the background; and this has always been felt to be one of the chief difficulties in the Christian ethic. From the outset the Church was troubled with parasites—often worthless characters or rank impostors, whom in obedience to Jesus it deemed itself obliged to tolerate. . . . There can be no question that in the final issue the position of Jesus is unanswerable. Indiscriminate kindness may be blamed for many evils, but infinitely more harm has been wrought by man's blundering efforts to do justice.'[1] That the appeal to the static distributive and retributive justice of the law-courts was discordant with Jesus' whole outlook on life appears also from the passage about agreeing with one's adversary while one is on one's way to the courts; and it seems to me significant that St. Matthew reports this saying in the middle of a list of what are presented as the most novel and revolutionary elements in Christ's teaching.[2]

---

[1] *The Ethical Teaching of Jesus*, p. 74.

[2] Readers of this article who are acquainted with Professor Hocking's chapter on 'Christianity and Pugnacity' in his *Human Nature and its Remaking* will realize how much I owe to it.

Have we now made mention of all the relevant passages? It is difficult to resist the impression that there is something else. In the Parable of the Sheep and the Goats recorded by St. Matthew the Son of Man is represented as saying to those on His right hand, 'I was in prison, and ye came unto me.' They protest, 'Lord . . . when saw we thee . . . in prison, and came unto thee?' To which He answers, 'Verily I say unto you, Inasmuch as ye have done it unto the least of these my brethren, ye have done it unto me.' Dr. Montefiore thinks that the reference to the visiting of prisoners must date from the era of persecutions in the Church, the prisoners referred to being Christians confined in Roman cells; but that would surely throw the composition of the First Gospel into an unduly late period. The phrase 'my brethren' accords rather with Jesus' own way of thinking than with that of the Apostolic Age, and the saying that contains it is certainly one of the most exquisite that have ever been spoken in the world. So I am led to ask, *Was Jesus the first man in history to be sorry for prisoners as a class?*

Such, then, seem to be the aspects and elements of our Lord's teaching which, by a slow and gradual leavening process, and often in very indirect and roundabout ways, have inspired our modern doubts about the righteousness of the traditional attitude to criminal offenders. It is not to be denied that the gospel records, as we possess them, contain other elements that are of a very different kind. While there is much that points in the direction of the supersedence of static justice by ἀγάπη, there are also many passages in which strict retribution and distribution seem to be insisted on. This is especially true of the eschatological parables, in which God is presented as dispensing a justice of the most severe, and sometimes even pitiless, kind. It is, however, certain that some considerable deductions must be made from our first impressions of these passages, to allow for the later ways of thinking (especially about eternal punishment) which we are apt to read into them. To Dr. Leckie's admirable treatment of this matter[3] there has lately been added a careful inquiry by Mr. V. J. K. Brook.[4] And it is also noteworthy that the passages in question are in no small part confined to the record of the most Jewish-minded of the Synoptists —St. Matthew. 'It is only Matthew,' writes Mr. Brook, 'who suggests an exact and detailed scrutiny of the past.'[5] 'The phrase "there shall be the weeping and the gnashing of teeth,"' he writes again, 'is to be found six times in Matthew, only once in Luke, not at all in Mark.'[6] Even such a commentator as Dr. Montefiore holds that the teaching of the eschatological parables cannot be attributed to Jesus Himself. We must indeed be careful to avoid the temptation of attributing to our Lord such teaching as we ourselves can accept, and to the Synoptists themselves such as we cannot. On the other hand, we must leave room for the likelihood that the originality of Jesus' teaching was far greater than the evangelists ever make it appear, and that the more forward-looking elements in the Synoptic doctrine are those which most truly represent His teaching, while the persistence of apparently contradictory older ideas is due to a defective grasp of His meaning, and a gradual falling back into traditionalism, on the part of the disciples and evangelists. The claim, boldly made some years ago by a distinguished free-lance in this field of discussion that 'ideas in the Gospels which differ from the mind of the age [in which He lived] are more likely to belong to the mind of Jesus,' still represents an entirely open possibility—in spite of all that has been said by the adherents of an extreme apocalyptic reading of our Lord's teaching. Yet it may be urged that the conception of a judging God which appears in the eschatological parables is closely in line with Jesus' own treatment of the Pharisees as well as of the vendors and money-changers in the Temple. If He who said 'Judge not' could so severely judge, then could He not teach that the God who was a loving and forgiving Father could also judge severely? And there will be some who will find no degree of contradiction between such mercy and such judgment, believing that each is a component part of that perfect righteousness of God which was reflected in the face of Christ. This closing paragraph cannot settle any of these larger issues, but only indicate them.

---

[1] *The Ethical Teaching of Jesus*, p. 85 f.

[2] One other passage, Lk 12^{13-15} is worth comparing with this.

[3] *The World to Come and Final Destiny.*

[4] *Divine Justice: A Study in New Testament Teaching* (Oxford, 1929).

[5] *Op. cit.*, p. 43.

[6] *Ibid.*, p. 28.

Mary or Elisabeth?

By J. Rendel Harris, Litt.D., LL.D., D.D., Birmingham.

Who was it sang the Magnificat? The tradition of the Church, as gathered from the Gospel, is that it is the song of the Blessed Virgin; and it is only in quite recent times that a claim has been made for the authorship of Elisabeth. The grounds for such a change in the name attached to the canticle are (1) Biblical, (2) Patristic. The evidence of the MSS and versions is not unanimous for the reading in Lk 1^{46}, 'and *Mary* said, My soul, etc.' There is good Old Latin evidence from three of the best MSS (codd. *a*, *b*, *l*) that *Elisabet* was read in place of Mary, and it is interesting to note that we can catch the corrector of one of the MSS in question revising his text so as to get rid of a name that was thought objectionable. In the next place we have the evidence of the Latin text of Irenæus to the same effect, nor is there any reason to suppose that the lost Greek text of Irenæus had any other reading than *Elisabet*.[1]

The question, then, may be asked whether there are any reasons for affirming one reading against the other. Ought we to say that the judgment of the Church is decisive in the matter, and has given the authorship to Mary, or shall we say that a preference should be accorded to the other reading on the ground of its early circulation and proved deletion in later times? A familiar dilemma. For we cannot presume that the Church is always wrong when it has an overwhelming majority of suffrages on its side, nor, on the other hand, that the struggling minority of insufficient attestations is safely to be disregarded.

It has occurred to me that a ray of light might be let into the Council Chamber from an unexpected quarter.

All students are aware that the songs at the beginning of the Gospel of Luke, as well as their prose setting, are suspected to have a Semitic origin, whether Hebrew or Aramaic, an observation which is capable of reinforcement from various turns of speech, and valuable to the higher critic because it distinguishes the Birth-sections in Luke from the rest of the Gospel. That the supposition is not inept may, perhaps, be allowed from a use to which I put it in the explanation of the obscure sentence in the Song of Simeon, where I proposed to alter [2]

> A Light for Apocalypse of Gentiles,
> And Glory for thy people Israel:

to

> A Light for Galilee of the Gentiles,
> And Glory for thy people Israel.

Syriac scholars will see the reason for the correction, Galilaia for Galiana, and Old Testament scholars will recall the passage in Isaiah (9^1) that is involved in the change, which itself is familiar to us by its quotation in Mt $4^{15, 16}$.

When we turn to the other Canticles, the *Benedictus* and the *Magnificat*, and print them side by side, we can easily see that they are inspired by common thoughts and marked by parallel expressions. If they do not come from the very same mint, it will be a surprise to any one who is familiar with the literary criticism of the Bible. The reader can work it out for himself. I do not need to spend time over a matter so obvious. They are literary compositions, not historical records.

On the assumption, then, of a Semitic origin for the Lucan Canticles, we turn to the Song of Zacharias to see whether there is any personal reference in the text. It is an important question, because it has been suggested in some quarters that the Canticles are merely national hymns, and have no historical connexion with the Gospel. One direction in which we look for an historical link would be the name of Zacharias himself. When he was born, his father gave him a name which means that 'Jahweh has remembered (us),' namely, in the birth of a child; and this meaning would have been carried over to the offspring of Zacharias, if there had not been a miraculous contradiction of the application of the father's name to the son. In any case, the name which the father bore never lost its meaning; he carried the remembrance of God's mercy about with him. When we turn to the *Benedictus*, we find this very thought to be emphasized; God has undertaken

> 'to perform the mercy promised to our fathers,
> *and to remember* his holy covenant; the oath

---

[1] The Oxford editors should have restored it throughout.

[2] See The Expository Times for 1917–18, vol. xxix. p. 58.

which he sware to our father Abraham, etc. etc.'

If we turn this back into Semitic speech, we shall see Zacharias looking at us from the script. We may, if we please, write Zakar-iah on the margin in Hebrew letters. That is as it should be, if the canticle is to be something more than a nationalist hymn.

In the next place, when we turn to the *Magnificat*, where we are faced with a similar problem and with the interpretation of language which is certainly parallel to that of the *Benedictus*, we find the singer recounting what God has done for her, and how

He hath holpen
his servant Israel, *In remembrance of his mercy;*
As he spake to our fathers, to Abraham, etc. etc.

The parallelism of this passage with the one previously quoted may lawfully be invoked to prove that the mercy, promised and performed by God, is the same grace in both cases. That is to say, it is the birth of John and not the birth of Jesus which is the theme of the singer; and since Mary can hardly be expected to sing *Magnificat* over John, we infer that she is not the singer, but it is perfectly in order that it should be Elisabeth. From which we infer finally that it is the name of Elisabeth which stood originally at the head of the canticle, and should be restored to it. If that leaves Mary songless, we have a reason before us for the subsequent modification of the text. The same conclusion is implied in the statement that 'the Lord had *magnified His mercy* with Elisabeth, which corresponds to the versicle in the Canticle that He that is mighty hath *done great things* for us . . . *and His mercy* is for ever and ever.' If the foregoing criticisms are just, it will supply us with one more vindication of the Western text.

In the Study.

Virginibus Puerisque.

'信—Faithful.'

By the Reverend Alexander Baxter, Hawick.

'Know therefore that the Lord thy God, he is God; the FAITHFUL God, which keepeth covenant and mercy with them that love him and keep his commandments to a thousand generations.'—Dt 7[9].

THOSE of you who have read Bunyan's *Pilgrim's Progress* will remember that one of the men in that story is called 'Faithful.' We don't need to ask what kind of man he was because his name tells us. He was 'faithful.' Now if you could read Chinese you could learn what the man who first wrote that queer-looking character I have shown you meant by 'faithful,' because in the character he has really given us a picture of his meaning. Look here: the character is made up of two parts: 亻 which is 'a man' (a short form of the original 人). The other part 言 means 'words' (the mouth 口, and I suppose what comes from the mouth 言). So, you see, we have a picture of A MAN STANDING BY HIS WORDS—the Chinese 'Faithful.'

Now let me tell you a story from China. You all know that China has been greatly troubled by brigands or robbers in recent years, and that one of their favourite methods of robbing is to steal, or kidnap, people and force from friends of the people captured large sums of money for ransom. A Chinese friend of mine was once captured in this way and carried off to the hills. He was a teacher in a Christian College, and the robbers thought the college would pay a large sum of money for his ransom. It, however, could not do this, and would not. Time passed, but one day some friends of the college discovered a man who was really the leader of the robber band. They told him the college would never pay any ransom money, and asked if he would visit it, see the work that was going on, and talk things over with the missionary in charge. 'We will do you no harm,' they said, 'you need have no fear, for Christians keep their promises.' The robber believed this, and promised to visit the college. The evening before he was due to arrive, a number of Chinese students and young teachers turned up at the house of the missionary. They were quite excited, and said they had come with a plan for getting back the teacher from the robbers. Their plan was next day to capture the robber leader and lock him up till he made arrangements to set free the teacher. When the missionary first reminded them of the promise made not to harm the robber, they replied, 'Oh, but you do not need to stand by your words to a robber; robbers would not keep their promises to you.' After talking over the matter in the light of Christ's teaching, however, they soon saw that the missionary was right. So the robber came, and went away free and unharmed. Not long after the teacher was set free also without any ransom. That is not the end of the story, however. Before the teacher came back the missionary had a visit one day from two young men. One he knew was a Christian and the other was not. 'I have brought a friend to see you,' said the Christian Chinese, 'he wants to be a Christian and to join the Church.' A talk followed, and the missionary asked the inquirer what it was that first made him want to be a Christian. The reply was, 'What you told us that evening about Christ requiring His followers to stand by their words to everybody—even to a robber.' He then went on to say how different he felt his life would be if he could be faithful like that: how different China would be if all Chinese would be faithful like that: and how different the world would be if all nations would stand by their words to one another. He had come to see that Jesus was the only one who had done this Himself perfectly, and made us see that God was that kind of faithful God. So step by step he had been led to desire to trust and follow the faithful Christ, and be made a faithful disciple.

It was a happy day for the missionary, and the next time he read the old Chinese character it had a new meaning for him. It didn't speak to him only of the Chinese scholar who first wrote it, but of Jesus who wrote it again by His own life and teaching, fulfilled it with a new meaning, showed us it was a picture of God Himself, and gave to men an example and a power that could make them faithful even unto death.

'Frank Buckland's Monkey.'

By the Reverend E. A. Anthony, M.A., Trowbridge.

'Whatsoever thy hand findeth to do, do it with thy might.'—Eccles 9[10].

When I was a boy I was very fond of a book that seems to have disappeared. I never come across a copy of it nowadays, but it was a book well worth reading. It was the life of a great naturalist, whose name was Frank Buckland. He loved all animals and was deeply interested in them. He was even fond of disagreeable animals, and made pets of snakes and ferrets and toads. His house was a menagerie of beasts and birds and reptiles. People who stayed there never knew what animals they might meet, wandering about the stairs or passages, or coiled up in their beds. Frank Buckland didn't mind, and he couldn't see that some people might be upset at finding a snake coiled up in the bed, or by a monkey jumping on to their shoulder and catching hold of their hair. There were some amusing stories in that book about the animal pets of that strange household and their adventures. The one I liked best was the story of one of the many monkeys who lived there, from time to time. This particular monkey spent most of his time in the kitchen. He found it was an interesting place. The cook's back was turned now and again, and he could snatch up something nice to eat. If she did not give him a chance of stealing anything, well, she would sometimes drop something, and his little fingers would snatch it up in a moment, and with a spring he would be up out of reach on the top of the cupboard. Then, too, there was always a good fire burning in the kitchen, and it was pleasantly warm for a monkey who disliked cold and damp, and who liked a fire even on a summer day. One cold day the monkey strolled into the kitchen. The cook was not there. There was a big pan of water on the cooking range, and with a monkey's curiosity he put his paw in the water. It was pleasantly warm, so up he climbed and sat down in it. It was delightful. He felt really warm for the first time since he left his sunny home in Africa. But before long he began to feel it was just a little too warm. So he stood up—ugh! the air felt quite cold, so down he flopped again. He did that again and again, and all the time the water was growing hotter, and if that long-suffering cook had not come in, caught him by the neck, lifted him out and given him a smack that sent him, chattering and grimacing, scurrying away, I think he would have been boiled alive.

I have never forgotten that story. There are times when we can all understand that monkey. It needs an effort, doesn't it, to step out of a nice hot bath on a cold night? I don't think there is one of us who has not lifted up the bedclothes some cold winter morning, put one foot out, and then snuggled down again. I think, too, we have all come to know that in other matters, it is the first effort, the first step that is most difficult. Whatever it may be,—some task we don't like, some duty we would like to avoid, some wrong habit we want to conquer—the best way is to face up to it and to tackle it at once. The longer we play about with it, the longer we put off doing it, the harder it will be. Perhaps we shall never do it. Often when I have found myself trying to get out of some difficult task or duty, that I know I shall have to do in the end, I have remembered the story of that monkey.

Will you remember it too?

The Christian Year.

THIRD SUNDAY IN LENT.

The Father of Mercies.

'Blessed be God, even the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, the Father of mercies, and the God of all comfort.'—2 Co 1[3].

In the opening verses of the Second Epistle to the Corinthians we find St. Paul using some old words about God in new sequences of thought; he puts the old words together in new ways, in fresh combinations; he talks of God as the Father of mercies and as the God of all comfort. Now it would be easy to show that there is nothing novel or original here. That God is our Father was taught in the Old Testament, before Jesus and His apostles re-emphasized it in the New. 'Like as a Father pitieth' is not far apart from 'Father of mercies'; and the 'God of all consolation' is certainly no different Being from Him who spake by the prophet and said, 'As one whom his mother comforteth, so will I comfort you.' Thus we might be tempted to assume that the Apostle's language here merely refers to the Father-God and Mother-God of the ancient Hebrew Scripture.

On the other hand, we might proceed to hunt for Hebraisms in the terms St. Paul used; for instance, we might say that 'Father of mercies' means simply 'merciful Father,' and 'God of all consolation' means 'all-pitiful God'; and then we might stop to reflect that we had isolated a couple of God's attributes.

At Cambridge there exists a famous lectureship called the Hulsean Lectureship, designed for the defence and vindication of the Christian religion. The founder of this lectureship, Mr. Hulse, ordered by his will that the lecturer in any given year should discourse upon some one or other of the attributes of God, and that *when these were exhausted* some other religious or moral subjects should be selected. From the present-day themes upon which the Hulsean lecturers discourse, we need not infer that the attributes of God have been exhausted, but only that God cannot finally be known in an eighteenth-century manner by any list of qualities like a botanist's description of a plant. In Scripture the attributes of God come out incidentally from His observed actions, by which we infer that He is, or that He knows, or that He feels—including, maybe, that He suffers. Certainly St. Paul was not making contributions to a Hulsean catalogue of Divine potencies and virtues, when he talked of the mercies of God and the comfort of God. He was a plain man, talking plain things to plain people.

We also are plain people, occupied with the simplicity of things. When, therefore, we are told that God is the Father of mercies, we observe that God has a family, and also that the Father takes His name from the family, and is known in terms of them. Our simplest parallel will be the passage in the Gospel of St. Mark, where Simon the Cyrenian is called the father of Alexander and Rufus. The Evangelist wants to explain to those to whom Simon the Cyrenian might be an obscure individual, whose personality and dignity were hard to discern, that he was the father who had given to the Church two notable Christians who did not need to be introduced because they were well known already. It was not that Simon of Cyrene really needed a family illustration. We can see, however, that even then people had not realized what honour had been his when he was commandeered to help in the carrying of the Cross, and how near Simon stood on the earthly plane to the great anonymous angel on the upper plane who had drawn near to the Lord to strengthen Him in the Garden of Gethsemane. The family illustration just meant, 'If you do not know him that way, you may know him this way: for all of you know Alexander and Rufus.'

Let us return to our theme: the mercies of God, and God as the Father of the mercies; God as the Father of a family, and the mercies as the family by which God is to be known. It is a very beautiful family, an array of loved and lovely forms. Here are three of them in a specified group, which we come across constantly; they are known as Grace, Mercy, and Peace. These three belong to the postal service of heaven, and teach unskilled people how to begin and how to end a letter. The 'Ready Letter Writer' of heaven, on which the apostles were brought up, tells us to open the letter with 'Grace, mercy, and peace, from God our Father and the Lord Jesus Christ,' and to end with a similar triple farewell.

Sometimes these three fair forms come to visit us; they knock at the door, and wait for us to open it and give them welcome. They tell us, 'We are come to stay with you.' 'Come in, dear Grace,' we reply, 'your room is ready on the very ground-floor of my life; and you, Mercy, shall share the living-room with me; and you, sweet Peace, there is an upper chamber prepared for you with an eastern outlook, from which on fine days one can see as far away as Paradise, and where the opening heavens will often shine with beams of sacred bliss.'

We again notice that the family of God which we are studying is spoken of in the plural—to intimate that it is a very large family. We are not to Hebraize the word 'mercies'—as the commentators on Genesis do with the much-disputed word *Elohim*—and say, 'this is a plural of majesty, and it means that God's mercy is very great.' It is a family—not 'a plural of majesty.' It is a very large family; it includes grown-up children—the flower of the faith and experience of the past, together with some that are very little, newly arrived and always the dearest, because they are so little and so new. As for the grown-up members of the family, these are sometimes known as 'the former mercies.' In the heading of Ps 61 they are spoken of comprehensively as the 'former experience'; *David fleeth unto God upon his former experience.* When they are thus grouped together, they go by the common name of Ebenezer, and they form a choir of their own with a special book of songs appropriate to the places where they sing. By the way, that description in the Prayer Book of 'choirs and places where they sing' has a much wider range of locality than the insides or upper ends of churches. When David's heart was overwhelmed, he addressed his psalm from the ends of the earth. At another time he, or some one in his name, constructed a choir on the margin of a horrible pit, and made the bricks for its building out of miry clay, and then broke out into a new song for the new sanctuary, even praise to our God. But the 'Ebenezer Hymn Book'—there is nothing like it! There are some stately songs in it. One of them begins:

When all thy mercies, O my God,
  My rising soul surveys,
Transported with the view I'm lost
  In wonder, love, and praise.

Among the lovely group of the Father's mercies there are two who are constantly in evidence. Some have called them by the name of

New mercies each returning day;

their real names, however, are rather longer, and run as follows:

Pillar-of-cloud-by-day,
Pillar-of-fire-by-night.

Their service is continuous, as it is written, 'He took not away the pillar of the cloud by day, nor the pillar of fire by night'—which is another way of saying, 'I will never leave thee, nor forsake thee.'

In conclusion, among this lovely company of the Father's mercies there is one more stately and more lovely than all the rest. She is called *Crowning Mercy*, and sometimes they name her *Great Deliverance.* Every consecrated life knows her, sooner or later; every believer confesses her. Her special anthem is *Nunc Dimittis.* Not every one recognizes this lovely form before the closing day of life, but all believers behold her then. She brings us the message that Jesus is able to save us *to the uttermost*, that is to say, 'up to the goal.' With the goal in sight, she sings of 'sweet fields beyond the swelling flood,' and of the sweet denizens of those fields; and of Jerusalem, the happy home; and of the City which is the continuing City of God.[1]

FOURTH SUNDAY IN LENT.

The Dignity of our Lord's Death.

'I have power to lay down my life.'—Jn 10^{18}.

These words carry within them an unusual and memorable suggestion of reserve and dignity, a hint of the majesty in which the Saviour offered Himself, unhurried and uncompelled.

There is a passage in Amiel's *Journal* in which he says that 'Napoleon with his arms crossed over his breast is more expressive than the furious Hercules beating the air with his athlete's fists. People of passionate temperament never understand this. They are only sensitive to the energy of succession: they know nothing of the energy of condensation. They can only be impressed by acts and effects, by noise and effort. They have no instinct of contemplation, no sense of the pure cause . . . which does not need to throw itself into violent motion to be certain of its own power.'

Some of the saints have loved to pause in reverent contemplation over against this passage, finding something here in their Lord which they did not find so clearly any other where. Here is what

---

[1] J. Rendel Harris, *As Pants the Hart*, 132.

Dora Greenwell saw in it. 'The Man Christ Jesus was, of all created beings—as far as we know their history—the only one who chose His own destiny, who foreknew and accepted its full conditions; who saw a great need and responded to it—"Lo, I come." "My leave," said the acute Frenchwoman, "was not asked before I came into the world!" *Our Saviour's leave was asked.* His fulfilment of His Father's will was voluntary.' Thus reverent eyes behold Him as no helpless victim of circumstance. Here is no mere prey of the mighty, caught in the man-traps of a world's hate. Here is one who, uncompelled, offers Himself.

1. At this point two important things are done for our thinking on this whole theme. The first lies in the vision of the self-determination of our Lord, with all that is implied of reserve and dignity. He is the Captain of His own soul in becoming the Captain of ours. This is important for a practical reason. One of the reasons why some modern minds halt before the Christian ethic and hesitate to launch themselves upon a sacrificial life is that it seems like a slave-morality to lay oneself down in front of one's fellows, and be trampled upon by every foot, and drained by an endless demand. If we take this utterance of our Lord, and use His life and actions as a commentary upon it, it becomes plain that His conception of sacrificial living and sacrificial loving was very different from that. He was not a passive agent, letting Himself be trampled upon without discrimination or be drained as much by men's whims as by their needs. When they asked Him to be a judge and a divider, He refused to shoulder a responsibility that was not meant for Him and gave them instead a parable and a sermon. There are some wise words on this point in Dr. Newman Smyth's *Christian Ethics*. Speaking of love to one's neighbours, he says: 'A friend who does not keep himself in the pure worth of his own soul has nothing worth giving to another. True self-love (not love of the happiness of self but of the worth of the self) is therefore the antecedent condition of all genuine and worthy love of others.'

There is something here which is very close to some of our practical perplexities. Christian sacrificial love is not to give every one all he asks, but to offer to God and to man the best we can do, and the best we can be, for man and for God. When we hear our Lord say, 'I have power to lay down my life,' we are close to that same lesson. He does not regard His life as a ball to be tossed lightly about, or to be crushed by any hand that cares to grasp it. He holds His soul like a citadel in trust for God's service and man's true welfare, and He retains His self-direction, subject only to the overruling will of His Father, as that will shall progressively reveal to Him His true path of obedience and service.

2. But these words do a second thing for us, not inconsistent with that first thing: they supply a needful corrective to our usual idea, which is apt to be the world's idea, of power. When men think and speak about power, they tend to think too exclusively of power to dominate, and far too little of power to serve. Yet it is well to remember how great a part that second kind of power has played, and does still play increasingly, in the life of the world. Benjamin Kidd's *The Science of Power* is full of suggestion to any one interested in politics or ethics or the problems of human society, whatever the philosophers may have to say to the validity of his argument. His position is that the Darwinian doctrine of evolution—the theory of development through the struggle for existence—carries us only a little way. It accounts for the efficient individual: the inefficient perish, the efficient survive. But then he goes on to show that evolution has now reached a new stage, the social stage, and at this stage a new law works. In the struggle for his own development the individual had to assert himself: now in the struggle for the perfected society, the individual has to learn to subordinate himself. Here lies the vast scarcely tapped reservoir of power for the future.

> In social development the eternal law of efficiency can only be summarized in one word—Sacrifice. . . . The progress of humanity has over and above every other feature this meaning. It is the epic of the vast, tragic, ennobling, immortalizing, all-conquering ethic of Renunciation.

If that be in any measure true, then our Lord when He said 'I have power to lay down my life' was not only stating His own personal power and obligation, He was illustrating a principle vital to human progress.

There are two practical results for those who believe and would obey.

We bow with adoring and endless gratitude before the Lord Christ, who in His life and death brought the sacrificial principle to its full fruition. This idea of power must not be lost sight of: His use of it here ought to re-fashion the moral universe and be like a talisman against worldliness and against materialism. All the way along, those who knew Him felt a strange suggestion of power about Him. There was power of healing, power of teaching, strange power over Nature's forces, as if He were in some mysterious way allied with the ultimate sources of control. But it was all power of service. And the power in Him had not turned to weakness—rather it had mounted to its greatest intensity, it clothed itself in its uttermost sublimity when at the last, in the exercise of His power over Himself, He stretched Himself upon the Cross. So He became the world's High Priest, and so the Cross became the one Shrine for ever for souls that know their need and their sin. Because He incarnates in Himself a principle which is neither arbitrary nor accidental, but is set into the very nature of things and into the course of this world's events, it is no surprise that a listening ear should overhear every creature, saying, 'Blessing and honour and glory and power be unto him that sitteth upon the throne, and unto the lamb, for ever and ever.' And we who, being, like patriarchs and prophets, creatures of human sin and need, have sought long for the altar where we may meet with God, know that our quest is ended. He gave Himself for us. With Him we give ourselves to God.

A second point emerges. It is morally impossible to bend in adoration and gratitude before the sacrificial Christ without coveting something of the same spiritual likeness. Is this sacrificial way indeed God's chosen way of helping and uplifting the world? Then men who number themselves among His redeemed are in honour bound to be His helpers in the task. More and more it becomes apparent that there are no self-contained lives in human society, or rather that in proportion as men try to be self-contained and self-regarding they remain mutilated and incomplete. To acquire the sacrificial spirit may cost them much: to live without it may in the long run cost them more. 'Vicarious suffering,' says Dr. Inge, 'which on the individualist theory seems so monstrous and unjust as to throw a shadow on the character of God, is easy to understand if we give up our individualism.' No Christian is called to give up his *individuality*: there the dignified self-direction of the Master teaches us a great and unexpected lesson. But every Christian, by the fact of his being a Christian, is called to give up his *individualism*. Then the burdens and tasks that come are undertaken not with querulous claims for justice, but with the eager spirit of those who have seen the glory of service. 'I have power over my life'—that is true of every man as of Him, true within smaller limits, perhaps, but true.[1]

Fifth Sunday in Lent.

The God of Different Personalities.

'I am the God of thy father, the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob.'—Ex 3^6.

1. These three men stand as types of character in all ages of Israel. Abraham is the type of all men of faith—those who adventure their souls after God. Isaac is the type of men whose religion is quiet, meditative, almost timorous. Jacob is the type of men of double nature: worldly and devout. And our text tells us that God is the God of all these types of human nature. He has no favourites: He is as much the God of the uninteresting Isaac as of the double-dealing Jacob; as much the God of the double-dealing Jacob as of the far nobler, more heroic Abraham.

All of us are included in one or other of these three types. Abraham, the 'Father of the faithful,' is the representative of all who in every age have had a faith in God strong enough to drive them forth from the religion of their fathers in search of a purer religion. Now God is the God of all such men. Much of the present rebellion against the faith of our fathers is quite unworthy of respect. Nevertheless, this rebellion against tradition sometimes springs from a Divine inspiration. And if that is true of any of us, then Abraham's God is our God. He responds to that trust which ventures our life itself upon Him. Often we will be in doubt, often the Divine promise of hope in our heart will be disappointed; but sooner or later the God of Abraham will lead us, as He led him, to ends and issues diviner far than anything of which we now dream.

But God is not the God of the adventuring only. He is the God of Isaac also—of quiet, uninteresting, commonplace men and women. And in truth this is well for most of us. For most of us, undoubtedly, live quiet, uneventful lives, that seem to accomplish little. Yet, however uninteresting we may seem, God has an interest in us. He is the God of ordinary and commonplace men and women who have no history. He has His own dealings with Isaac—His own course and methods of special education for him as surely as for his father and his son. There is not one of us overlooked by God—not one wholly commonplace in the eyes of the Eternal. Lincoln once dreamt that he overheard some one say of him, 'What a plain man!' and that he turned round and answered, 'Yes: God likes plain people. That's why He made so many of them.'

And now we turn to Jacob, and find ourselves face to face with another personality. He is two men: worldly and unworldly—crafty and devout. In short, he is the type of multitudes in all ages. Is God the God of such men? Many are indignant at the favour shown to Jacob in Scripture, almost shocked that God should have anything to do with a man so treacherous. They dismiss as hypocrites our modern Jacobs—members of the Church who are also men of the world. Fortunately, God does not dismiss them. He has no love of worldliness, or craftiness, or treachery, any more than we have; nevertheless, just because Jacob needs Him so badly, He becomes Jacob's God. He passes such men through many a painful struggle with their own sins, if by any means out of the wily Jacob He may create the diviner Israel. There are few Scriptural phrases for which most of us have greater reason to be profoundly thankful than this —'the God of Jacob': the God who does not turn away in contempt even from men of double nature; but who will do His best for them, bearing long with the duplicity which He hates that He may in the end cast it out.

---

[1] J. M. E. Ross, *The Tree of Healing*, 114.

2. And, further, God is a different God to these three types. Of course, He never changes in Himself: yet He seems to change with our changes. A man of one temperament thinks of God in one way: a man of another temperament in another. Similarly, experience of life gives its own bias to our thought of God. Hence no two men worship precisely the same God.

Take Isaac's conception of God. When Jacob was pursued by Laban he objected that Laban would have sent him away empty-handed 'except the God of my father, the God of Abraham, and the fear of Isaac had been with me'; and, again, to ratify the agreement come to between them, he 'sware by the fear of his father Isaac' (Gn $31^{42.\ 53}$). To Isaac, then, God was a Fear—so much so that He was called 'the fear of Isaac.'

Contrast this fear with Abraham's conception: 'Fear not, Abram: I am thy shield and thy exceeding great reward.' This idea of God sprang out of his character and circumstances. A wanderer in a land of which he possessed not so much as a foot, called to defend his kindred from the lawless kings of the country, he grew to feel his great need of a shield in the midst of constant danger: and God said, 'Fear not: I am thy shield.' Further, God had promised him a land and a great posterity: yet neither land was given nor son born to him. And in reply to his natural disappointment God says, 'I am thy exceeding great reward.' How different is all this from Isaac's Fear—God no terror threatening his life, but a protecting shield: his exceeding great reward, more to be desired than any of His promises!

The thought of God changes once more with Jacob. True, his conception seems to change from form to form; but perhaps his most characteristic name for God is 'the Rock of Israel.' It is a name which fits in with Jacob's own temperament. In spite of his double dealing there was in this man a certain tenacity of purpose which could not be turned aside—a rock-like firmness which could not be shaken. And he came to recognize the same firmness in God. Against that Rock he dashed his life in vain wrestling to have his own way. And then the Rock against which he broke himself became the firm foundation of his life.

These three conceptions of God represent in general the three typical attitudes of men towards the Deity.

3. And, further, God had three different modes of educating these men, according to their nature and their need. Abraham's faith was purified by many disappointments. But this school of disappointment would have been disastrous to Isaac, incapable of the Divine unrest of Abraham. Hence God gave him what training he was capable of receiving through his family life: not all of it happy, as we see from the rivalries of his sons. All this is changed when we turn to Jacob. Undoubtedly he had disappointments, like Abraham, and family training, like Isaac; but his chief school was in struggle with his own sins. He wrestles with his own craftiness, his own worldliness, in the darkness of the night by the brook Jabbok. It is his own strength, his trust in his own cunning, which gives way when the sinew of his thigh shrank. God gave Jacob that great education which changed him into Israel in the school of his own sins. It is a painful school; yet the only one for men of Jacob's character. The only thing that would rouse such a man was just to feel his own sins closing in round his life, his duplicity entangling him like a net, and to understand that there was no way of cutting through the entanglement save that of straightforwardness and honesty—becoming a new man, worthy of his new name of Israel.

The idea underlying all this is the individuality of God's dealings with every human soul. To each type of nature and character He gives that personal, individual training which it needs. And out of that training He gives to each a separate, individual revelation of Himself. And, however hard it is to believe this, be sure it is true of all men. Never read the words, 'I am the God of Abraham . . . of Isaac . . . and of Jacob' without remembering that God treated these three according to their separate individualities, their distinct nature and needs, and that so in all ages He treats all human souls, and our souls with the rest.[1]

Palm Sunday.

Life through Christ's Death.

'And it came to pass, when the time was come that he should be received up, he stedfastly set his face to go to Jerusalem.'—Lk 9^{51}.

1. Very early in the Christian era, one of the New Testament writers, summarizing the work which Jesus Christ had accomplished by His mission to the world, said that He had brought life and immortality to light through the gospel. That was the difference Jesus had made for mankind. He had given the promise of *life*, given it in such a way that men could lay hold of it with sure confidence. The Christian gospel came into a world over which death brooded like a pall. It was the world of Jew and Gentile. The Jews were the little minority, the Gentiles the great mass of human kind. Yet the world was thus truly divided, for the Jews had knowledge of the unity, the sovereignty, and the ethical holiness of God, while the nations outside their pale were groping in a hundred different ways amidst idolatries. But, for Jew and Gentile alike, the course of man on earth was shadowed by the forebodings and the fear of death.

We may take as witness their literature. No one could say that the Old Testament is a happy book. There are songs of rejoicing, and countless utterances of dogged confidence in a final victory of good, past all seeming. But it is shot through with these, rather as a dark day of cloud and storm is shot through with gleams of sunshine. Its general tone is of judgment and retribution. And no one could affirm that the literature of the pagan world was a literature of happiness. Its best poetry, when it is not light and frivolous, is set in a tragic key, despairing of human life and ending with a great interrogation, however nobly uttered. The same is true of its best history and philosophy. But the New Testament—the literature of the generation that woke with wondering eyes to faith in the gospel of Jesus Christ—is above all things happy, as is all the literature that has been born out of its inspiration up to this day. It comes from men passing through fires of tribulation and persecution—a despised and often outraged minority in a great world set against them. And yet it rings with joy, with the sense of triumph, certain, complete, and final. It is no sad story. There are sad things in it. We must endure to read there of men bearing great sorrow of heart, of some men's awful sinning, of one man of perfect heart torn in the agony of Gethsemane, deserted and betrayed by His friends, and crucified. But the sad things are as discords in a piece of music which are resolved into glorious harmony. And the joy and the brightness and the triumph come from this—that here is a message for men, which they have been able to receive and believe and prove for themselves in the experiment of living by it, of *life* poured into them which nothing can destroy. Death stands in front of them still, death as one of the facts of this present world, with its premonitory weakness and pains, sometimes its accompanying tortures. Still loved ones pass, one by one, out of their sight. Still the body decays. Still the passage through this world is a pilgrimage which ends at a portal where the gate opens only to those outgoing, and allows none to see the mysteries hidden on the farther side. But these men who have embraced this message of the gospel are certain that they *live*, and that this life of theirs is beyond the reach of harm. And with this conviction of *life*, everything is changed for them in what we call living. This transmutes all values.

It is well that we should sometimes look back like this and try to see in the broad light of the New Testament record as a whole what it was that Jesus had done for men, looking at it as a fact of human history. He made men—those who believed the message—secure in their confidence in *life*, life eternal, begun here and now, life in God. And Christianity has gone on proving itself worthy of men's acceptance, through all the centuries that have passed since the beginning, because people have been brought by it into that same confidence.

2. Jesus Christ brought that gift of life to men by going, of set purpose, to meet death. 'He stedfastly set his face to go to Jerusalem.' And we know the Gospels well enough to know that that is the meaning of it. Jerusalem meant death. The more we read the story of Jesus, the more it comes home to us that the most astonishing thing in it is the fact that He took this dying at the hands of men as a purpose. That is woven into the whole narrative. Early in the story, in the days of His success and popularity as a teacher in Galilee, when the storm clouds of opposition had hardly begun to gather, we read of His defending His disciples against the Pharisees' rebuke because they did not fast, by comparing them with the bridegroom's friends who could not be mournful

---

[1] J. S. Carroll, *The Motherhood of God*, 128.

while the bridegroom was with them. ‘But the day will come when the bridegroom shall be taken away from them.’ When the clouds had begun to lower, and He had withdrawn more and more into solitude with His disciples to concentrate on teaching them and preparing them for their work in coming days, after Peter had confessed his belief that He was the Messiah, He startled them all by beginning to tell them plainly that He must go to Jerusalem and be rejected and killed. He took three of them apart to share with Him a vigil of prayer on a hill by night. They had a remarkable experience of seeing Him transfigured to a form of dazzling brightness, and hearing Him in converse with Moses and Elijah. And what they heard them talk of was the death which He should ‘accomplish’ at Jerusalem. And as the story draws on to its close, more and more persistently this is in it: Jesus is certain that He must die. He knows He has a baptism to be baptized with and a cup to drink; He is shut up to it by a Divine constraint. And when He sits to keep the Passover with His disciples, He draws them into a final, loving covenant with Himself and with His Father by the cup which He bids them drink henceforward in remembrance of Him, and says it is the covenant in His blood. The Son of Man is come to give His life a ransom for many.

As we try to think into the story this is the most wonderful thing in all the life of Jesus. This makes Him stand truly alone. We may compare His teaching with that of others and not be sure that His words are absolutely unique. His example of integrity and unselfishness, that may perhaps be paralleled in others who have been great and good, faithful and devoted even to death. His mighty works of compassionate power, these are not without analogies in other records. But in Jesus we find all this, this high teaching, this pure example, this compassionate power, along with something unparalleled—the purpose to die, that thereby men may live. ‘Except a corn of wheat fall into the ground and die, it abideth alone; but if it die, it beareth much fruit.’ That is what makes the death of Jesus different from—something more than—a martyr’s death. Socrates was willing to die, believing that gain might come to others from his death. So has been many another. Jesus was *determined* to die.

Ride on, ride on in majesty!
In lowly pomp ride on to die;
O Christ, Thy triumphs now begin
O’er captive death and conquered sin.

Ride on! Ride on in majesty!
In lowly pomp ride on to die;
Bow Thy meek head to mortal pain,
Then take, O God, Thy power, and reign.

What does it mean? Not for theology, not for theory, but for the business of our living?

It means that we have been loved with an everlasting love; that God cares that we should live with life abundant; that He has done the uttermost that love can do that we might share this life with Him. It means that we are debtors. ‘This have I done for thee: what hast thou done for me?’ And it means that we know how our debt must be paid. ‘Hereby know we love, because he laid down his life, and we ought to lay down our lives for the brethren.’ We have been saved for life, and life here means service and sacrifice in love to others, following Him.[1]

---

[1] H. C. Carter, in *Lenten Sermons*, 29.

Recent Foreign Theology.

Varia.

In a volume of three hundred and thirty-two large pages[1] Professor Weiser of Heidelberg has subjected the prophecy of Amos to as acute an examination as it has ever received, more particularly on its psychological side. It is a courageous attempt to penetrate the secret of the prophet’s religious experience. This has been in part obscured, he believes, by the theological glosses of later editors, who modified or reinterpreted the words of Amos. He argues, for example, that in 7^{7b} an original אֲנָךְ was displaced by אדני and then transferred to the end of the clause, so that the vision of ‘*the Lord* standing beside a wall made by a plumb-line’ (חומת אנך) was originally only the vision of ‘a *plumb-line* laid to a wall’ (חוֹמָה). The visions were not ecstatic, but simply normal experiences of ordinary or exceptional things (like the drought and the locusts), to which the quality of revelation comes to be attached through the prophet's relationship to God. In the first two visions Amos shares the beliefs of his countrymen; in the last three, another and stern conception of God, opposed to that of the people, breaks through.

---

[1] *Die Profetie des Amos*, von Artur Weiser (Tőpelmann, Giessen; Mk.18).

Weiser divides the book into the Visions and the Words, and he deals first with the Visions as presenting more directly (except for glosses) the immediate experience of the prophet. The two groups were combined, he thinks, during or shortly before the Exile. His criticism is pretty drastic: he denies, for example, the whole of chap. 8 to Amos, except the first two verses, though he admits that the verses he rejects are suggested by genuine words of the prophet. And he also rejects $2^{10.\,11a.\,12}$, with their significant references to the prophets and nazirites. There are similar exegetical surprises: the famous 5^{24}, for example, he interprets as referring to the flood of the Divine judgment, and in 3^{12a} he accepts the reading 'Damascus' (suggesting that בְּמִשְׁכַּב has fallen out after ברמשק); he believes that Amos is here lashing the plutocrats who have one house in Samaria and another in Damascus. The מֵעִיק of 2^{13} he thinks does not need to be emended into מפיק: it may be connected with the Arabic *ʿāḳa* ('I will cause it to crack, or crackle'—with reference to the earthquake). There are other textual suggestions worth considering: *e.g.* 7^{4a}, קָרֵב לַהַב אֵשׁ, 'a flame of fire drew near.'

Of special value are the concluding discussions which aim at interpreting the religious experience and ideas of Amos. While admitting that Amos was the implacable foe of the cult and the champion of morality, he strenuously maintains that the moral quality of Jahweh is not really for Amos the thing of central importance, but rather His sovereignty. In her worship as well as in her social life, Israel is too much occupied with herself, and too little with the God who is *above* her, and who must be taken seriously, or her doom is sealed. The religious moment, which, of course, includes the ethical, is for him supreme.

The indefatigable König, who is nothing if not thorough, has given us a bulky commentary on the Book of Job,[1] which takes into careful account all recent commentaries and deals exhaustively with every conceivable aspect of the book, grammatical and syntactical, as well as exegetical. He does not believe that Job owes anything to his Babylonian counterpart. The present prologue he regards as the expansion of an earlier and briefer one; he defends the authenticity of the Wisdom chapter (28), which he connects with 27^{1-10} (27^{11-23} being regarded as an interpolation). In common with most scholars he considers the Elihu speeches and the descriptions of the hippopotamus and the crocodile (40^{15}–41^{26}) to be later additions to the poem, but he defends the authenticity of the epilogue (42^{7-17}). On the basis of 12^{17-19} he assigns the book to the time of Jeremiah, after the deportation of Jehoiachin in 597 B.C.

To the interpretation of 'dust and ashes' in 42^{6} he gives a new turn: 'I spurn and repent of my former attitude, seeing that (as over against God) I am but dust and ashes' (cf. Gn 18^{27}). He interprets the famous verses 19^{25-27} as pointing to the hope of immortality, though not to the resurrection of the body, and he translates: 'After (the loss of) my skin, which has been reduced to shreds (by the destructive forces of disease), and deprived of my flesh, I shall see God . . . and not as one estranged.' The twelve pages devoted to this passage discuss and refute the divergent views of other scholars. König shows a fine appreciation of the amazing literary quality of the book, and he writes in the hope that his presentation of its discussion of the problem of evil and suffering will help to dissipate the gloom and disablement of the pessimistic mood. König is always just to the scholars with whom he disagrees: fair-mindedness, as well as wide learning and thorough competence, especially on the linguistic side, characterizes this volume, as indeed all his work.

Ignaz Gábor, of Budapest, offers a revolutionary view of the Hebrew accent,[2] which, he pleads, originally fell not on the last syllable but on the first. He does this by showing the extraordinary prevalence of alliteration in Hebrew poetry, of which he gives abundant illustration, and he argues that the alliterated syllable was in all reasonable probability the accented syllable: 'an alliteration in the weak and toneless part of the text is a *contradictio in adjecto*.' This is also the governing principle in old Hungarian poetry, apparently also in old Latin poetry. The Massoretic accentuation need not be supposed to represent ancient usage, and the problem, therefore, comes to be under what (? foreign) influences the accent was moved from the beginning to the end. The stress, represented by the methegh, on the second syllable from the tone, lends some corroboration to this view. This suggestive essay deserves attention from students of the Hebrew tone. On p. 15, Jes 25^{19} should be 24^{19}.

---

[1] *Das Buch Hiob, eingeleitet, übersetzt und erklärt*, von Eduard König (C. Bertelsmann, Gütersloh; M.22).

[2] *Der Hebräische Urrhythmus*, von Ignaz Gábor (Töpelmann, Giessen; M.1.80).

With a volume on the First Epistle of Clement [1] Harnack brings to a close the work of the Seminar in Church History which he has conducted for fifty-four years (1874–1928) in Leipzig, Giessen, Marburg, and Berlin. This volume, with its characteristic thoroughness and alertness to all the literary, historical, theological, and ecclesiastical implications of early Christian literature, will be welcomed by all admirers of the great Church historian. Harnack believes that this epistle has never received the attention which it deserves, either from the Church of Rome or the evangelical Churches or theological science. He regards it as, next to the N.T., the most important document of the early Church, and with this the study of Church history should begin.

A German translation of the whole epistle is followed by a discussion of the authorship, the sources, and the ecclesiastical situation in Corinth, and there is appended a list of problems raised by the letter and deserving further consideration. For all its Greek dress and Hellenism the letter, Harnack suggests, in the feeling for authority, order, law, and obedience which pervades it, breathes the Latin spirit; indeed, parts of it make on his mind the impression of being translated from Latin. And he makes the interesting suggestion that here on Christian soil the spirit, the claim, and the power of Rome has already made itself felt: the community at Rome dared to ascend the throne, which was accessible to every Christian community. 'Already in this document she reveals that peculiar understanding of the conceptions of "Order, Law, Obedience, Charity, Harmony, Unity, and Peace" which is characteristic of her, and which ended by transforming the league of brethren into an absolute monarchy.'

The vexed question of the chronology of the Kings of Israel and Judah is discussed at great length and with much acuteness by Begrich.[2] It has hitherto been the fashion to deny the historical value of the synchronisms, as due to editorial manipulation. Israel, it is argued, would not have dated the accession of her kings with any reference to the Kings of Judah, whom she despised, and similarly the jealousy of Judah would have led her to ignore Israel in dating the accession of her own monarchs. Begrich makes short work of this hypothesis by showing that the exigencies of daily life, legal contracts, pilgrimages, etc., to say nothing of their common origin, language, and religion, would have obliged each nation to consider the other in the matter of dating. Besides, for centuries such synchronistic reckoning had existed between Babylon and Assyria, who were anything but friendly to one another. Thus Begrich accepts the reliability of the chronological tradition embodied in these numbers; indeed, he pays more respect to all the Biblical evidence, including the Chronicler, and even to extra-Biblical sources, such as Josephus, than is common. He believes himself to have discovered five different systems of reckoning the years, which, when fully appreciated, can be reconciled with all the available data. Among other results he recovers Is 14^{28-32} for Isaiah, a passage which becomes intelligible the moment it is seen that Ahaz and Tiglathpileser III. died in the same year (727–726 B.C.). Interesting questions about the calendar and the writing of Hebrew numerals are incidentally raised and discussed. Begrich argues that on the accession of Hezekiah the beginning of the calendar year was moved from autumn to spring.

A Roman Catholic scholar has written the History of Revelation in the Old Testament.[3] By revelation he understands not only that which usually goes by this name, but everything connected with the life, politics, and culture of Israel, as that is held to be all definitely related to revelation. The scope of the book is therefore wide, and the author defines its purpose as 'to acquaint students of theology with the material of the sacred books in their historical succession.' Professor Feldmann's method is to sketch the contents of the Biblical books, which he does, section by section, in considerable detail, and then to elicit and emphasize their religious value. He has a wide and accurate knowledge of the relevant Protestant as well as Roman Catholic literature, and he inclines to relatively conservative positions. He accepts the general credibility of the patriarchal narrative; the patriarchs are historical persons, the Decalogue is Mosaic, the prophets introduced no new religion, etc. The book, which carries the story down to the Babylonian exile, might almost have been written by a conservative Protestant not unfriendly to criticism. There are interesting and informing sections on the culture as well as the religion and politics of the various periods. The volume is a good blend of moderate criticism, information, and edification.

---

[1] *Einführung in die Alte Kirchengeschichte. Das Schreiben der römischen Kirche an die korintische (1. Clemensbrief) übersetzt und den Studierenden erklärt*, von Adolf von Harnack (J. C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, Leipzig; M.4).

[2] *Die Chronologie der Könige von Israel und Juda und die Quelle des Rahmens der Königsbücher*, von Joachim Begrich (J. C. B. Mohr, Tübingen; M.15).

[3] *Geschichte der Offenbarung des Alten Testaments, bis zum Babylonischen Exil*, von Dr. Franz Feldmann (Verlagsbuchhandlung P. Hanstein, Bonn; geh. M.7.60, geb. 9.60).

There has just reached us the last contribution to Old Testament Science,[1] from the pen of Harold M. Wiener, M.A., LL.B., who was done to death by Arabs on 23rd August last in the Palestine disturbances. The doughty opponent of current critical methods and results, he was himself a sufficiently radical critic, as this volume amply shows. Dissatisfied with the common view that 2 S 9–20 constitutes a source by itself, he re-examined the material, with the following results. The main source in Jg 9–1 K 2 he calls N, and the second continuous source in 1 S 17–2 S 24 he calls G: N stands for Nathan and G for Gad. 'In the reign of Solomon, Nathan or somebody in sympathy with him wrote a history which extended from the period of the Judges to the death of David.' 'Side by side with N runs G, which is characterized by hostility to Saul.' The source indicated by G was not, however, written by Gad, but by some one who lived in the period between Rehoboam and Athaliah. 'G is Judean.' Each (*i.e.* N and G), 'is interested in the Jerusalem Temple and in extolling a member of the Judean dynasty. Nowhere is there the slightest sign of sympathy with Ephraim or the northern kingdom.' In a characteristic concluding passage, we are told that 'the relationship of N and G has a valuable lesson to teach to those who follow the so-called literary criticism. We have here two sources so closely akin in style that it would be impossible to distinguish them by the criteria on which the documentary critics are accustomed to rely.' The death of Mr. Wiener is a loss to Old Testament Science, all the more to be regretted as he was a scholar of acute and independent mind, who went his own way, undeterred by any consensus of authority.

In a reprint entitled *Halt hart am Wort*, from 'Die neue Kirchliche Zeitschrift,' Professor Vollrath, who knows Great Britain well, gives a lively and informing description of British Church life, with its many denominations and its different types of service and sermon. The English people, he tells us, are sympathetic to Esau, who was a sportsman and a gentleman; and in respect of his caution, Gamaliel is typical of the English temperament. The essay helps us to see ourselves as others see us.

The interest of the last number of the *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft*[2] is more highly specialized than usual. Hertzberg discusses at great length the site of the Mizpah, which lay a few miles north of Jerusalem, and decides in favour of *en-nebi samwîl*. Professor Robertson of Bangor offers a careful textual discussion of Is 27^{2-6}, a song which seems to him to have an Arabic basis, and he suggests a reconstruction of the Hebrew text, which appears to underlie the LXX version of the poem. F. Bork deals with the chronology of primitive Biblical history from Adam to Joseph, with a detailed comparison of the evidence afforded by the Massoretic Text, the Samaritan, the LXX, and the Book of Jubilees, which, though late, is far from worthless. W. Mundle presents 'the religious problem of 4 Ezra.' This book, with its strongly developed sense of sin, has sometimes been regarded as the Jewish counterpart of Paul. Mundle argues that this appearance is quite deceptive. Nothing in the book offers a real parallel to Ro 7 or Gal 3; its thoughts are essentially those of Pharisaic Judaism: it points backward to O.T., not forward to N.T.

JOHN E. MCFADYEN.

Glasgow.

Philo's Allegorical Method.[3]

DR. STEIN begins with a useful analysis of allegory in connexion with metaphor and symbolism, and proceeds to discover the begetter of Jewish Hellenistic allegorizing in Aristobulus. The main contention of the pamphlet, which is one of the 'Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die AT Wissenschaft,' is that Philo really carried on a tradition which came down to him, that he was not original in his allegorical interpretation of Scripture, and that he did not know Hebrew. The last-named opinion sounds hazardous. It is surely difficult to believe that Philo at Alexandria, for all his Greek predilections, was not acquainted with the sacred tongue of his people and his religion. Apart from this, however, Dr. Stein challenges the ordinary view of allegory with some success. It was evidently more domiciled in Judaism than has been recognized; also its variations were remarkable. Whether the source of it is not to be found, partly at any rate, in other quarters as well, is a further question. It goes without saying that Philo's originality is not affected by such a stimulating theory as that propounded by Dr. Stein, for the results of the Philonic method remain, whatever be its origins.

---

[1] *The Composition of Judges* ii. 11 *to* 1 *Kings* ii. 46 (Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, Leipzig; M.5).

[2] 1929. Heft 3. (Töpelmann, Giessen; Mk.5.50.)

[3] *Die Allegorische Exegese des Philo aus Alexandreia*, by Dr. Edmund Stein (Töpelmann, Giessen; M.3.20).

St. Paul's Career.[1]

Professor Steinmann is particularly interested in the possible influence of Tarsus upon the Apostle. He collects many relevant data about the political and religious phenomena of the city, including the philosophical interests at the local university, though he thinks that Ramsay and Boehlig have gone too far in speaking of an actual 'university.' He shows how the apostle in his formative period must have come into contact with Hellenism as well as with the strict Pharisaic Judaism of his home. Furthermore, Dr. Steinmann is disposed to agree that Paul was proud of his local connexion, and that he refers to this when he uses the term συγγενής, or fellow-citizen, as he does in Romans occasionally (ch. 16), when he applies the term to Andronicus, Junias, Herodion, Lucius, Jason, and Sosipater. It means that these were not simply Jews, but members like himself of the same tribe, Hellenistic Jews who shared his tribal connexion.

Two other points are made in this lucid and temperate study. Dr. Steinmann refuses to believe that the name of 'Paul' was taken at the episode of Ac 13^9; the Apostle from birth was called 'Saul, otherwise Paul.' Again, in Ac 22^3, we are invited to read 'I am a Jew, born at Tarsus in Cilicia, brought up (ἀνατε θραμμένος) in this city (*i.e.* Jerusalem) at the feet of Gamaliel, taught according to the strict law of our fathers,' etc. The importance of placing the comma not after 'this city' but after 'Gamaliel' is that Paul was sent early, about the age of fifteen, to Jerusalem for his education, probably to stay with his married sister. By that time he would have received the common home instruction on religion. The origin of Paul's acquaintance with Greek life and of his insight into it is left unsolved by Dr. Steinmann, who prudently contents himself with indicating the possibilities and noting the salient data.

The Virgin Mary.[2]

Dr. Koch's essay is upon the Early Church traditions concerning the marriage of Mary, which are to be traced down to the fourth century, a problem which, as he points out, has been discussed by at least one English theologian, Dr. Lightfoot, in his essay on 'The Brethren of the Lord.' To put it briefly, we may say that Dr. Koch incisively restates the data for the Helvidian theory. According to Tertullian, Mary lived in real marriage with Joseph after the birth of Jesus, though this is ignored by some modern Romanist writers. 'Adhuc virgo' is Tertullian's phrase, and Dr. Koch argues that the same phrase in Irenæus has the same sense, viz. that after the birth of Jesus, Mary no longer remained a virgin. Indeed, he sets himself to prove from early patristic tradition that prior to Origen, if we leave out the gnostic 'Protevangelium Jacobi,' there is no real indication of any claim for perpetual virginity. In the Western Church it is not until Hilary of Poitiers (*i.e.* in the middle of the fourth century) that we come upon the interpretation of Mt $1^{18.\ 25}$, which denied that Mary lived in actual marital relations with Joseph after the virgin-birth. Dr. Koch's trenchant historical essay concludes with some general investigations into the prevalent misconception that references to 'the virgin Mary' imply her ἀειπαρθενία. How timely such criticism is, may be gathered by a reading of the pages devoted to this legend by D'Alés in the *Dictionnaire Apologetique de la Foi Catholique* (1916), iii. 199 f.

Troeltsch on Christianity.[3]

The second edition of this work appeared as far back as 1912. But the subject is always with us, and Troeltsch's arguments are not yet out of date. The position taken up in the book is familiar to students of theology and history, though it was so unfamiliar as to be upsetting in some circles when it first appeared. Troeltsch faces the relativity of history frankly and endeavours to show that if we do not make the mistake of starting from a theoretical idea of Christianity as the absolute religion, we may arrive at what amounts to the same thing by finding that for the faith which appropriates Christ His religion is the supreme manifestation of valid religious truth. A sense of the Absolute is essential, on his view, to any great religion. But the superior value of one religion to others cannot be understood apart from an historical appreciation of its working in human life throughout the centuries. Such are some of the ideas which dominate this treatise. Evidently it still has a vogue, though like some equally outstanding German monographs it has failed to secure an English translation. It ought to be read alongside of the writer's other works, but it forms an independent contribution to the subject, and its re-issue is therefore to be hailed as a fresh proof of the interest in Troeltsch's original approach to the problem.

---

[1] *Zum Werdegang des Paulus: Die Jugendzeit in Tarsus*, by Alphons Steinmann (Herder & Co., Freiburg im Breisgau; M.2).

[2] *Adhuc Virgo*, by Hugo Koch. 'Beiträge zur Historischen Theologie' (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr; M.3).

[3] *Die Absolutheit des Christentums und die Religionsgeschichte*, by Ernst Troeltsch. Dritte Auflage (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr; M.6.50).

RECENT FOREIGN WORK IN CHURCH HISTORY.

Acts of the Martyrs.[1]

It is not often that so admirable and essential a handbook as this comes to the aid of serious students. The study of the early persecutions cannot be carried out apart from a constant reference to the sources, and these are not always available as they should be. In German we had von Gebhardt's *Acta Selecta* and Knopf's volume, of course, but the latter went out of print, and new material appeared. The present volume is a new and enlarged edition of Knopf's work. It contains the Greek and Latin originals, with a few textual notes at the foot of the page, and also with excellent bibliographies. The English student has indeed Mr. Owen's recent *Acts of the Early Martyrs* (Oxford), which is indispensable. But Mr. Owen gives translations, not the original texts, and instead of thirteen we have in this handbook no fewer than thirty-three. The only martyrdom included by Mr. Owen and omitted by Krüger is the short account of Procopius (A.D. 303) by Eusebius.

On the *Martyrdom of Perpetua*, Krüger does not mention in his bibliography the English edition and version by Mr. R. W. Muncey, which in spite of some errors is a useful book for the English student.

There are copious indexes to the Biblical references and to the proper names. Altogether this is a book for which one is grateful indeed.

The Early Luther.[2]

Like Krüger's *Acts of the Martyrs* this is issued in the 'Sammlung Ausgewählter Kirchen und Dogmengeschichtlicher Quellenschriften (Neue Folge).' It is the second edition, much improved, of a book which has already won its rank. Also it bears testimony to the revived interest in Luther which is so remarkable at present in Germany, France, and England. The reason for this extraordinary outburst of Luther-studies is partly due to the Barth theology and partly to the impetus given to the study by Roman Catholic investigations, which have prompted Reformed critics to work at the problem on various lines, till their scholarship is now more than abreast of the Roman writers. The work is partly dogmatic, partly literary, and partly historical. This volume is an amazingly convenient collection of passages which throw light on Luther's early growth. The first part consists of extracts from his own writings and from other writers; the second part is devoted to extracts from his own writings between 1501 and 1519. No better collection could be well imagined for the reader who desires to follow the evolution of the reformer's experience and ideas during this formative period. The extracts are in the original Latin or German. Capital bibliographies and indexes are provided. The print is clear, and the get-up of the book is comely. We are indebted to the publishers and the learned editor for producing such a timely guide to the study of the subject.

Reformation History.[3]

The series called 'Evangelische Theologie ihr jetziger Stand und ihre Aufgabe' has now reached, in its third section, the second part of Church History, and in this volume Dr. Krüger supplies a conspectus of recent work on the Reformation and the Counter-Reformation. It is packed with bibliographical information, which enables the student to discover what has been done and how it has been done. The references to French and English work might have been fuller, but otherwise the survey is comprehensive. Indeed, the editor recognizes frankly the contributions from Scandinavia and Italy to the appreciation of Luther in particular. No one who is working at any part of this period can dispense with the guidance offered by Dr. Krüger in this elaborate and accurate pamphlet.

---

[1] *Ausgewählte Märtyrakten.* Dritte neuarbeitete Auflage, by Dr. Gustav Krüger (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr; M.5.60).

[2] *Documente zu Luther's Entwickelung* (*bis* 1519), by Otto Scheel (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr; M.12).

[3] *Kirchengeschichte: Abteilung 1. Reformation und Gegenreformation*, by Dr. Gustav Krüger (Halle: Buchhandlung des Waisenhauses; pp. 50, M.2.50).

James Moffatt.

New York.

◆

The Words from the Cross.

IV. The Cry of Desolation (Mt. xxvii. 46; Mk. xv. 34).

By the Reverend Joseph Johnston, M.A., London.

The first three utterances of Jesus upon the Cross expressed His concern for others—a prayer for those who were crucifying Him, a reassuring response to the appeal of the penitent at His side, and an instruction to the beloved disciple, standing by, to take care of His mother. In everything He said thereafter His thoughts were turned in upon Himself. For three hours no word passed His lips. He was in the swoon of death, and may have shown only occasional gleams of consciousness, as His heart fainted and rallied again. Noonday darkness had come down upon the scene, and hushed the clamour of the crowd. It was not merely a gloom projected by the mental state of the onlookers who were supping their fill of horrors, but an actual atmospheric disturbance that had the effect of shrouding the gruesome spectacle in shadow. It may have been the precursor of the earthquake that followed, but as it is mentioned by the three synoptists, it is evidently meant to be interpreted as an indication of Nature's sympathy with the throes of her tortured Lord.

> Well may the conscious Heaven grow dim,
> And blacken the beholding sun.

On a sudden, the long silence was broken by a loud cry from Jesus—'My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?' The voice would sound louder than it was, framed in the stillness and distinctly heard. Matthew and Mark alone record this cry, and it is the only utterance of Jesus on the Cross that they record. It is given by Matthew partly in the Hebrew form and by Mark in the Aramaic, in which it was probably spoken, although the two may have been blended in the agitation of the moment. The cry is an echo of the opening words of Ps 22, but it need not be understood that Jesus was consciously quoting the Psalmist. If the words had been intended for human ears, we might accept them as a quotation, but when one is crying to God out of the depths of an agonizing experience, it is not natural to express oneself in borrowed phrases appropriate to the occasion, but in words of one's own, coined in the stress of one's need. When a scared child is calling for his mother in the dark, he cries as he feels, and that he may use a common call is a mere coincidence. The experience of our Lord was far from being unique. What is strange is to find Him having it.

I.

This cry of Jesus to His Father was misunderstood by those who overheard it. They thought He was appealing to Elias for help, when He was moaning for His God—groping blindly, with the mists of death in His face, for the comfort of His support. And we may be thankful that His words were wrongly taken up, for if their purport had been grasped, great play would have been made with them in deriding Him as, on His own confession, forsaken of God.

But with all the insight we have into the mind of Christ, it is but little we can make of a cry that sends a shudder to our hearts. It is a revelation of the unimagined suffering of His Spirit, and yet it conceals more than it reveals. But while the mystery at the heart of it is impenetrably dark, it is shot through with some streaks of light that help to make it luminous.

For one thing, it interprets the silence Jesus had kept so long. It gives us a vague conception of what the three hours of darkness had meant to Him. There was gloom within as well as without. So far as His sufferings allowed Him to be preoccupied with His thoughts, His silence indicated anything but composure. At length, the trouble of soul that surged within Him swelled to a tide of emotion that found vent in His broken-hearted cry, and to give a voice to misery is to ease it. It sounds like the wail of a castaway on desolate waters whose frail raft is being engulfed in raging billows, and it is that. It is the cry of one who was *in extremis*, stupefied by protracted pain, and reduced to uttermost exhaustion. In His sinking consciousness He was losing His grasp of all that life had held for Him. Death is a robber who can strip his victim before despatching him. Physical prostration can so cloud the mind as to blot out every relieving feature in the situation, leaving only blank misgiving.

II.

But the dissolution of the body cannot account for the desolation of soul, although it made its contribution to it. It fills us with dismay to hear this cry, because we are accustomed to think of good men dying in unspeakable peace, clasped in the confident embrace of the everlasting arms, and we cannot help contrasting their serenity with the scaring experience of the Saviour. But then, they die fortified by this very death He suffered, as having been endured for them. 'It was for their peace that he was chastised. The stripes that were laid upon him have brought them healing' (Is 53^{5}). His was the task of the pioneer who has to blaze a trail through the terrors of the pathless wild, and gives to all who come after him a security he could never know himself. It has been revealed to us by the Spirit, who shows us the things of Christ, that here He was 'tasting death for every man,' and death meant to Him not what we call death and He called sleep, but something unutterably terrible. The 'sharpness of death' He had to overcome before He could open the Kingdom of Heaven to all believers was not the pangs He suffered in His body, but the horror that flooded His soul. 'It is in the soul that things happen.'

But what leaves us still astonished in this melancholy cry 'as from the soul's depths upborne' is that one who all His life had felt so sure of God should miss Him now when He needed Him most, and when He was doing His will—even unto death. 'My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?' If we stress the word 'thou,' as we cannot help doing, we feel the pulse of Christ's aching heart. It was no new experience for Him to be forsaken—by men. All through His life He had been travelling a lonely road. When He began His public ministry, His family broke with Him, and even His mother, who treasured in her heart so many secrets about Him, could not give Him understanding sympathy. His own townsfolk threw Him over. The crowds that flocked to Him at first gradually melted away. His nation rejected Him, at least through their official leaders, and brought Him to His end. And in His trial-hour, the companions of His own choosing failed Him, and left Him to His fate. But through all this treatment which harrowed His sensitive spirit He made no complaint. Once only, that we know of, when many of His following left Him after He had been dealing faithfully with them, He turned to His intimates with the wistful appeal, 'Will ye also go away?' But then, as always, He found sanctuary in His communion with God. 'And yet I am not alone, because the Father is with me' (Jn 16^{32}). That was His security, and as long as He had that retreat, there was no need to count His company. Now, when no man was with Him. and He was drinking the cup which no man could share with Him, He fell back in His extremest need, on the last refuge of His unfriended soul, and for the first time He found no support. He felt Himself slipping into the abyss.

He had said, in prospect of this hour, 'I have a baptism to undergo, and how I am distressed until it is all over' (Lk 12^{50}). It is on Him now. He is passing through the flood where no one but Himself could go, and the waters are going over His head. This is the 'travail of soul' from which He shrank in the shadows of Gethsemane—not something coming to Him in the course of nature, or at the hands of men, but something that was the finishing of the work given Him to do. This horror of thick darkness had cast its gloom before it then, but now it was enveloping His soul as He entered into it. This is death, as the final syllable in the utterance of God's eternal decree of redemption.

III.

But when we have done all we can to take a sounding in the depths of our Saviour's distress, we have said nothing to account for it. Although

He was bearing the unspeakable load of human guilt He had taken upon Himself, it is not easy to satisfy ourselves that 'He who knew no sin' could know the sense of estrangement we feel when our sin makes us conscious of the hiding of God's face. For it is beyond all doubt that whatever our Lord may have felt, His Father was with Him,

> behind the dim unknown,
> . . . within the shadow,
> Keeping watch above His own.

This was 'His beloved Son in whom he was well pleased,' and never did the Father's heart rejoice over His beloved more than when He was glorifying Him in this crowning hour of devotion unto death. The Resurrection is the proof of it. Though here no word of comfort was spoken to the Saviour in response to His wondering cry, God gave His complete answer in the act of raising Him from the dead.

But the Cross keeps its secrets. There is a Godward aspect of it that, like the other side of the moon, is always turned away from us. We may not look upon it, for there our Saviour was dealing with His holy Father in our interests, and there lies the mystery yet to be revealed of His requirement that the Son 'should learn obedience by the things which he suffered' (He 5^8). But, taking off our shoes, we may venture so far on this holy ground as to suggest that it was part of the bitterness in Christ's cup that He had to drink it with the Father's face hidden from Him. His emptying of Himself meant self-limitation in knowledge as in other respects, and it would be the glory of the offering He made of Himself to know only His Father's will and not to know His way. His sufferings and the glory that was to follow, and how they are related, are 'things the angels desire to look into' (1 P 1^{12}), but not even Moses and Elias would be able to speak with knowledge of that mystery when they appeared in glory and talked with Him of the decease He was to accomplish. His meek submission to His Father's will was a recognition of the righteousness of the judgment He was bearing, but this was the Son's great, final act of obedience, and its perfection may have been expressed in accepting what it was given Him to do in the light of what it was given Him to know.

He believed in God against all appearances, and against His own feelings. For only bewilderment can be traced in this cry of His. No querulous note can be read into it. It is a prayer in His desperate need, 'offered up with strong crying and tears unto him that was able to save him from death' (He 5^7), and no prayer from the lips of Him in whose name all our prayers are made could go unheard. It was answered—in effect. As the darkness lifted from the landscape, so the cloud passed from His soul, and His serenity was restored. His last words reveal that He had passed through the flood and was stepping firmly to the shelving shore beyond. 'Father, into thy hands I commend my Spirit.' He had found His God again, so to speak, by reaching back into His after-thoughts—as He had done before, when His soul was troubled by the pressure of experiences upon Him.

IV.

The Cross was not set up merely for didactic effect, but so efficacious are Christ's sufferings that even His groans have significance for us and can bring healing to the wounded spirit. This woebegone cry of the Redeemer has given immeasurable comfort to a multitude of stricken hearts, who have felt how closely He has been identified with them as their kinsman. We have all to tread mysterious ways of suffering and sorrow, and fight a lonely battle at times with the terrors of the soul. When all that life held has been taken away and we lose touch with Him in whom we have trusted, the cry is often wrung from us, 'Where can God be in all this that is happening to us?' We upbraid the darkness in which we are enveloped, and there comes no answer but the scaring echo of our cry. For all who thus lose themselves in the wideness of God's ways, there is encouragement in this experience of the Redeemer, to cling to their faith in forsaken hours when there is nothing else to cling to, and to believe, as He believed, that the Father is with them, although they cannot see His face.

We need the assurance too, and we get it here, that it is our high calling to go through with what we believe to be the Father's will for us, even when we have missed the gleam we are following, and are feeling only what it costs us to go on. Suffering may impair our understanding, and human weakness cloud our vision, but

> Tasks in hours of insight willed,
> May be in hours of gloom fulfilled.

Feelings come and go, but if what we are bearing has its steadfast motive in obedience to what the Lord requires, it will get its vindication in the glory that will follow. And when the light comes back, we shall enter into the joy that was set before us, and it will be abounding and abiding.

Entre Nous.

Influences.

As we were reading that very fresh, queer, and charming book of memoirs called *The Story of San Michele*, by Dr. Axel Munthe (Murray), we came across this passage: ‘There is no drug as powerful as hope. The slightest sign of pessimism in the face or words of a doctor can cost his patient his life.’

The volume dropped from our hand as we considered the great influence a doctor has over those who come to him. Christ-like men, such as Dr. John Brown, Sir William Osler, and men not famous but known to ourselves, came thronging to mind, with all their power to cheer, and we recalled Aldous Huxley's saying in one of his ‘Proper Studies’: ‘The position of the medical man in the modern mind is almost that of the medicine man among the primitives.’ Indeed, he can cast down the anxious soul with a word, and condemn it to years of worry and fear by a single hesitating sentence.

It would not be a bad thing, perhaps, when next framing a set of thanksgivings, to say a word of gratitude for the noble doctors who encourage, uphold, support, and guide their fellows. It would be interesting to know if some mention of the vast power for good and evil given into their hands is urged upon them in their formal training.

The doctor, the minister of religion, the teacher—these are supposed to be the human beings with the most power over others. To take the last mentioned, picking up one of these admirable sixpenny yellow paper books sent out by Benn, ‘Educational Theories’ by Sir John Adams, we saw that psychologists are beginning to speak of the range of the teacher's effective personality, and to say that each teacher has an area in which he can make his personality effective, beyond which his power does not operate. We at once feel that this is true. We pick up the life of ‘Ionicus,’ or William Johnson Cory, Eton's most famed master, probably one of the most vigorous and commanding minds of the century. He would write to his boys, on whom his emotional approach to science, his reverential treatment of England's past, present, and future in class made an indelible impression—write wise letters in the holidays so that they did not slip from his ken.

‘Be unworldly, don't worship celebrities; like simple people—honest people.

‘Lift up your mind, and have a high standard for boys as well as ladies. Love none but the sweet minds. . . .’

The best teachers may well be called the Sowers, and that they are at work to-day, as long ago, is sure. Four living; nay five, could instantly be named. ‘*He threw pebbles into the pool*,’ Lord Esher said of a pale scientist known to him in youth. And of somebody else, ‘He threw seed on prepared ground.’

The doctor, the teacher, the pastor. Does anybody go through life without owing something to one of these? Yet even one child can influence another. What first influenced Temple Gairdner of Cairo to give himself to the consecrated life? It was the death of his loved young brother; as he bent over him in anguish, the Spirit came to him, and moved him to seek a new life.

In our ministry to-day are many sons of the manse who were brought up in a happy religious life. What an advantage! ‘Nobility of character,’ says McDougall, in that most human and kindly book of his, ‘Character and Conduct,’ ‘is the most precious heritage of a family—it is transmitted from generation to generation by the subtle processes of personal contact.’ The power of the sermon is still great, still disturbing. Witness the account given by Constance Collier, the actress, of her father's entirely changed life after hearing an address in church. Though the congregation may be particularly small this wet morning, the stranger in everyday attire is in the church, hungering for the Word.

And so, on we rambled in our thoughts on this great theme of Influence, and repeated: ‘Of all men, the doctor, the teacher, the minister have most power.’ How grateful are some of us, looking back on the word spoken in season! And how grateful have been those destined to play prominent parts in the world, for an early care, a timely warning. Arthur Benson records that Bishop Wilkinson on one occasion, just before he, the schoolboy, returned to Eton: ‘After breakfast on my last morning, pacing along the orchard path, spoke to me with an incredible perception and delicacy of the difficulties of school life, and the need of keeping the love of God alive in the heart. On our return to the house he took me to his room, we knelt together by the bed, and he prayed with me in quiet words, and then, drawing me to him, blessed me with tender affection.’ Schweitzer, surely the greatest living missionary, confesses that while he was being prepared for confirmation, though outwardly dumb, he was ‘almost ill’ from the feeling of the holiness of the time. Baron von Hügel pays tribute to the Dutch Dominican Friar who showed him the way: 'What a whole man that was! One with all the instincts of a man, yet all of them mastered and penetrated through and through by the love of Christ and of souls.'

And gazing at the list of books read recently, one perceives that Influence, the power of one being over another, steals into every one. Even in the stubborn 'Good-bye to all That,' Robert Graves reveals his deep reverence for T. E. Lawrence. In that noble memoir by Miss Duke on Lord George Murray is shown the blinding influence his Prince ever had on a loyal but clear-eyed slave. Mrs. Meynell stresses the effect of her father's personality on her. 'He constrained me in my judgments.' In 'Nickey, Son of Egg,' that tender-hearted tale, we hear of 'Somebody he had known a lifetime ago, whose face he had forgotten, but whose personal quality—some subtle essence more subtle than the scent of roses, pervaded with a breath certain moments of intensity.'

And do not let us forget C. E. Montague getting his first impression of what religion might be in church, not this time from the preacher, but from the sight of an ordinary man praying most fervently in a pew near by. That impression never left him. It tinged all his outlook ever after.

And so we mused on, not even touching the fringe of the great subject, not going so far as to touch on the influences of Nature. (Wings against the sun, do you know anything more satisfying?) And think of what the desert meant to the restless spirit of Gertrude Bell, how she soaked herself in the still, fantastic scene.

The influence of books! Hans Andersen falling under the spell of Scott. Naomi Royde Smith full of thrills and shudders, as a child meeting her first lovely hymn in church and being borne out in tears.

But there was slight uneasiness in all our thinking, a consciousness that something was being left out. The influence of Mothers, of Wives. . . . Vast, and subject for many more musings.

The family nurse, caring for all, ever ready with her faithful unwavering love, she perhaps has an influence for good equal to that of anybody. She does not change; at any rate, two we have known stood steadfast in their belief and affection throughout every vicissitude of fortune, and the very knowledge that they were alive and longing for news and meetings wrought a change on all the sunless patches of the fabric of life.

Influence, is there any end to it? Happy those who know their saints. But we all have some power. A stray sentence lingers, an opinion bears fruit. A change of tone can make tears spring to a child's eyes.

C. Miles.

Shere.

A Japanese Saint.

If it be unwise, as Solon said, to call any man happy before he is dead, it may also be deemed rash to call any living man a saint. The Roman Church prudently canonizes only the dead. In spite of this one may venture to say that if there is a man on earth of Christlike character and life it is Toyohiko Kagawa of Japan. His name is not so well known throughout the Christian world as it deserves to be. Had he lived in India we should doubtless have heard more of him. What his attitude to Mahatma Gandhi would have been might be difficult to say, but one gains the impression that he is a man of far more powerful intellect, and of wider knowledge than Gandhi.

Born in 1888 of a well-to-do family, he became a convert to Christianity in his student days. On declining to enter the diplomatic service he was disinherited and came as a penniless student to the Presbyterian College at Kobe, where he studied for the ministry. During his student days he lived and preached in Shinkawa, one of the worst slum districts in Kobe. After a period of study in America he returned to Japan and resumed work in his old haunts. Here he has continued to work, together with his like-minded wife, in a spirit of utter self-sacrifice and unwearying love.

The conditions under which he lived may be gathered from the following report. 'I had investigated the mortality of infants in our neighbourhood and was astonished to discover that of sixty-two born in one year, forty-five had died. Therefore I felt that raising children in the slums amounted to murdering more than half of them within the first year. In reality it is quite to be expected that children cannot be brought up in the slums, for we adults were constantly troubled with skin diseases, and my wife and I were afflicted continually with trachoma. As for other contagious diseases, during the thirteen and a half years that we lived here, our slum was thrice stricken with the plague, five times with cholera, twice with dysentery, thrice with small-pox, and every year without exception with typhus. In particular, at the time of the small-pox epidemic of 1917, ours was the only house that escaped, there being deaths in every other house.'

Amid such surroundings Kagawa has carried on his work as a Christian minister, social reformer, and labour leader. At first he was under suspicion as a revolutionary, and suffered imprisonment, but to-day his motives are better understood and his opinion on social and economic problems is highly valued by government. Although suffering from greatly impaired eyesight he has read very widely and found time to produce a surprising amount of literary work. His poems, novels, economic essays, Biblical studies, and religious books have an enormous circulation. His first notable book, 'Crossing the Death Line,' or as it is entitled in the English translation 'Before the Dawn,' took the public by storm, and 150,000 copies were sold in a few weeks. It is an autobiographical essay, in partly novelized form, dealing with his early spiritual struggles which ended in finding Christ.

A volume from his pen, *Love the Law of Life* (S.C.M.; 7s. 6d. net) has been translated by J. F. Gressett, and is issued with a Foreword by Dr. Rufus M. Jones, and a short biography of the author. The field covered is very wide, and the writer shows a really astonishing acquaintance with Western thought. He appears to have read all the best books not only in religion and sociology, but also in philosophy and science. He is himself a powerful and original thinker, and, what is probably unique in his writing, there continually breaks out through his reasoning a certain lyric passion which reveals a soul aflame with heavenly love. Briefly, the thesis of the book is that as God is love and has revealed Himself in the redeeming love of Christ, so He can be known only to the heart that loves as Christ loved. Moreover, to love in this way is the true art of life, and this spirit, when carried into the various departments of life, has power to regenerate social life, economics, art, science, and the whole realm of human activity.

Love and Labour.

'The real trouble is the dearth of love. Love is the only wealth. If only love be bestowed upon us, every economic problem will be solved. Labour is love's highest creation. Love is its trade mark. Without labour the perfecting of love is impossible, and without love labour is excruciating. The movement for socialism aims at restoring love to labour, and labour to love. Labour without love hurts like walking barefoot among thorns, while love without labour is playing with the toys of the devil. I abominate the present world order in which labour and love are divorced. When love discarded labour, labour abandoned love. Labour became punishment and love was changed to treason. To reunite the two, men have devised all schemes of anarchism, nihilism, despotism, and what not—but all have proved futile. Labour which is not for love, labour which is spent for destruction and violence, curtails all of life. . . . When love and labour are at last united, men will for the first time be enabled to bring social life to its consummation. Labour alone can maintain the body social. But loveless labour casts men down into the abyss of hell. Love alone gives cohesiveness to society. In fact, what I mean by "society" is "love expressed." Social economics is determined by the depths of love. Its credit systems, its exchanges, its investments, its traffic, its communications, its production, its consumption—all are determined by the depths of love. Love rejuvenates society. With love, then, let us effect our reorganization. With love let us purify. Love is the eternal revolutionist.'[1]

Love All-in-All.

'I see this love moving within me. Love decides my destiny. I am a part of love. Love determines my all. Love makes me hunger. Love nails me to the cross. Love is the sum of my destiny. O joyous fate! O gladsome tidings! If there is a destiny for me, it is love that decides it. I am bound to love: it is my glad fate. For love I suffer agony; for love I make appeal. But I, who am created to love, have so little of love; yet I have laid upon me the compulsion to seek the object of my love. Love to-day sends me afar to the cold North, and to-morrow sets me down on burning ground. Love is my master. In truth, man has laid upon him the great compulsion to love—to find a way into men's hearts by love. For love I am created; love may use me as it will. I cannot flee from love; the bonds of love, indeed, are my joy. I am infatuated with holy love. Love draws me on to the scaffold; yet I cannot forsake love. The sorrow of love's destiny is changed for me into a great evangel, a great art. Again, I declare, love is my all-in-all: love is my joyous destiny.'[2]

Dan Crawford.

Dan Crawford was of Gaelic descent. His forbears came from Arran. When quite a lad he got into touch with Plymouth Brethren in Greenock, and it was in one of their meetings at the age of twenty that his conversion took place. 'Sin—his sins—oppressed him as an awful weight ever dragging him down, down, down to an eternal hell of hopelessness and godlessness.' One Sunday after the little congregation left he sat on with four others. 'For two hours they laboured unceasingly to point out to him the way of Salvation.' At the end of the two hours, Dan was still in the depths of distress. Mr. Storer felt that everything would follow upon an initial move. 'He took from his pocket a thick carpenter's pencil, and with it drew a strong black line on the floor between Dan and the door. He said, "Now, Dan, you'll not step over that line until you have trusted Christ."

---

[1] T. Kagawa, *Love the Law of Life*, 207.

[2] *Ibid.*, 297.

'The next few minutes passed in silence. Then suddenly dropping his arms, and drawing a deep breath, Dan strode across the line, exclaiming in tones of decision, "I will."

'It was twenty minutes past ten by the clock on the wall when *Dan Crawford crossed the line.*'

Next year he met Frederick Stanley Arnot, who was touring England to recruit missionary workers for the vast empire in the interior of Africa which is now known as Katanga, and in the following year, under Arnot's leadership and along with twelve others, Crawford set sail for the Dark Continent. Although Arnot was nominally the leader, each of the men went on his own responsibility, trusting God for means of support for the work without any recognized human agency. 'One of the most profound realities of his life was that he gave no anxious thought, and indeed very little thought of any kind, to the machinery of living.' At one time he may be found eating grass seeds and white ants, at another dining sumptuously, the guest of a prince. Of the fourteen, only three struggled on to the interior. Most died, and some turned back. Again and again as the years went on, the expected reinforcements failed to get through to the interior. At times Crawford and his wife—Grace Tilsley, whom he had known in Bath, and who came out to be married to him at Luanza ('a great gift from God')—were quite alone.

The biography of *Dan Crawford*, which has just been published by Messrs. Oliphants (16s. net), is written by his nephew, Dr. G. E. Tilsley. He was Crawford's own choice. He had been with him in Luanza for a number of years—a medical missionary. He had long talks with Crawford, when he took copious notes, and he had access to all his diaries and to his voluminous correspondence—his letters to his mother and sister at home had all been rigorously preserved. The greater part of the volume is occupied with quotations from the diaries and letters. And so it is a very leisurely journey that the reader makes with Crawford from his first landing at Benguella on the 9th of May 1889 to his death on 29th May 1926 at Luanza as a result of a septic wound. 'Somehow or other he knocked the back of his left hand upon a raw-edged shelf near his bed. Was it in reaching out for paper and pencil to record yet one more flash of light, come to him in the night-watches to illuminate some point in the Word he loved better than anything else on earth? Tincture of iodine was within reach; he was accustomed to apply it to any abrasion; but he omitted to do so on this occasion.' The biography might have been pruned. There is, indeed, no doubt that in places this would have been a considerable improvement. But the biographer of Dan Crawford had no easy task. This missionary who thought black, who says, 'One thing I often wish I had not, and that is a white skin,' is no easy man to make real, and this is probably effected best after all by making him speak himself.

Again and again, Crawford lived alone with the natives in their own surroundings. '"I am sitting," he writes early in 1890, "in my little native mud-hut—near the door of it, of course, for there is no window. You could not picture nor plan a more humble yet withal comfortable abode than this of mine. I don't say there is not plenty to evoke European growls! For instance, the little fire, lit of an evening, of which the smoke has just to make its exit the best way possible owing to the absence of anything in the form of a chimney. The solitary stool standing just a foot from the ground is made of a piece of raw hide stretched over a four-leaved wooden framework barely a foot square. Add to this a narrow shelf-like native bed, a grass mat lying on the floor (upon which is laid all that these kind hosts of mine can ingeniously scrape together by way of food), and you have the exact inventory of the contents of my African hut." ' It was by living with the natives in this way that he got such an intimate knowledge of the Bantu languages. Dr. Laws says: 'Next to the late Dr. Henry, Mr. Crawford is the greatest linguist I have known in Africa.' You could not learn a language, Crawford believed, only by questioning. He said again and again, 'Remember you only hear what you *overhear*.'

Crawford had certain very strongly held views as to the best method of evangelizing. At first, at any rate, he distrusted station work and even educational work. He believed in the itinerating method. We quote here one of the many references to this in the letters and diaries:

'More and more I realize that my work must be itinerating the land with my Bible and the fewest possible followers, spreading the Good News. As we move from village to village I seem to hear Him who always was and always is with His own, saying as of yore, "Let us, US, go into the other villages also and preach, for therefore came I forth." '

His views broadened later. He recognized that educational work was necessary for the consolidating of the Christian life, that all the translation work he did was useless in face of a people who could not read, but the two words in the paragraph quoted, 'Let us,' represent his spirit to the last.

A typical picture of Crawford is given at the end of the biography. Less itinerating was being done now—this is 1925, about a year before his death. All over Luanza the Christians were forming local churches. Crawford himself was labouring in Luanza to complete his translation of the Bible. Sitting there one Sunday evening, he was giving a running commentary on the first chapter of James. 'But the secret of his strength lay not so much in his understanding of the Scriptures, as in the way in which he held himself open to their authoritative influence over his own life. . . . On the evening in question, he came to verse 19. Sitting with his worn Bible before him on the green table, he read out "*Swift to hear*——" He checked himself, raised his head, pushing his spectacles up on to his forehead, and said, "That's what I'm *not*. Miss Bryde knows that." He referred to the impatience with which he sometimes brushed aside that lady's endeavours to call his attention to specific points in the MSS of his translation of the Bible, upon which she was working with him.

'Readjusting his glasses, he read on: "*Slow to speak*——" Again he looked up with a wry smile. "I'm *not*. I want to get it out—be done with it quick." And then: "*Slow to wrath*——" . . . "Ugh!" said he, in vehement tones, "Ugh! *Kankalwa!*" (This signifies literally "I am confounded.")'

A Maurice Chair of Theology at King's College, London.

It may be remembered that in connexion with the Centenary of King's College, London, a movement has been started to endow a chair in the Theological Faculty in memory of Frederick Denison Maurice, to be called the 'Maurice Chair.' Mr. Harry Lloyd has recently contributed £500 to the fund, which has now reached a total of £1406. This is a long way off the sum of £25,000 which it is the ambition of the promoters to obtain, but the names of the Committee, representing as it does every school of thought in the Church of England, encourages the hope that the full sum necessary for the endowment will be obtained.

The following have recently joined the committee:

The Lord Charnwood.
Professor P. Gardner.
Dr. Albert Mansbridge.
The Master of Balliol College, Oxford.
Mr. Herbert Upward.
Mr. J. H. Oldham.
The Rev. Canon J. A. Douglas.

Those interested in this effort to commemorate a great man are asked to communicate with the Rev. Professor W. R. Matthews, Dean of King's College, Strand, London, W.C.2, who will be glad to receive any contributions.

Printed by Morrison & Gibb Limited, Tanfield Works,
and Published by T. & T. Clark, 38 George Street,
Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to The Editor, Kings
Gate, Aberdeen, Scotland.

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

In our day the subject of personality occupies much attention. It has received new emphasis in current philosophy, and educational theorists are insisting that the true aim and end of education is the development of full and effective personality. It will be worth while to recall the Christian view on this subject, especially as we are naturally inclined to hold that Christian personality stands for the educational ideal of full and effective personality.

For the pattern and standard of Christian personality we turn to the example and teaching of Jesus Christ. We believe that He is 'the light of the world,' and that to follow Him is to have, or to put ourselves in the way of having, the 'light of life.'

But it is sometimes said that the principle of imitation, even of the imitation of Christ, is, in the last resort at least, a barrier rather than an aid to the ideal life, to the attainment of highest character, the achievement of true personality. Is not freedom of the essence of personality? Is not a person a voice, not an echo? But the objection has little more than theoretical force. What force it has, it probably owes to the dubious modern conception of personality as personal existence or identity, self-contained and impenetrable.

We need not, however, enter into the problem of personality. We may be content to affirm that truly to follow Christ is not to hinder in oneself the realization of complete personal life. On the contrary, if we look to those who have asked Christ, in the phrase of the *Pilgrim's Progress*, to set down their names, and have then given themselves wholeheartedly to His service, we may learn of them what an enriching and enlarging experience it is to follow Christ, how it breaks down barriers and hindrances and sweeps the soul into freedom and power, how it enables a man to launch forth joyously into the fullness and depths of personal life, mind and heart and will united in one great allegiance.

What, then, is the Christian ideal of personal life? What is that 'light of life' which Christ holds up to us as a beacon of character and achievement? We might well approach the statement of the Christian ideal by first considering this question—How do Christian men and women reach the experience of religion? For some, religious experience is bound up with faith in Christ as their redeemer and saviour; for others, it is the response of obedience or loyalty to God, in whom the moral ideal is at once fulfilled and guaranteed. Perhaps religion comes to men and women at the present day in the second of these ways more than in the first—as a moral behest, a challenge to moral adventure, a signal and summons flashed from the heights of moral idealism.

Obedience is then one element in the Christian ideal of life, for most of us perhaps the primary and central element. The very central truth of our religious experience is the hand of God upon us, urging us to rise above all meanness, selfishness, and calculating prudence, above all that divides and distracts our lives, into a life which is unified, integrated, and complete. The Christian is he 'that doeth the will.' Said Christ Himself, 'My meat is to do the will of him that sent me.'

But Christ also said, 'I am not alone': 'He that sent me is with me'; and this points to a second element in the Christian ideal, namely, *fellowship with God.* 'All my springs are in thee,' said the Psalmist; and this is a truth to lay hold of as we seek to pursue the way of obedience or loyalty to the Divine will, which is the way of moral enlargement and achievement. It should help us on that way to be in touch with the springs of our life, to lift up our eyes constantly unto the hills whence cometh our help.

The life of fellowship with God may also be regarded as one, not of upgoing towards Him, but of ingoing upon Him. For our God, in the well-known phrase of mystical religion, is the Beyond that is within. Thus it is but to uphold again the ideal of fellowship to lay stress on the need of cultivating spiritual faculty. If anything will secure for us that unification and integration of personality in which our highest life consists, it is the letting of ourselves go, so far as we may, into the infinite life of the eternal, indwelling God.

If one movement of the religious life as it leaves its central level is describable as upgoing towards God, or as ingoing upon Him, there is another movement which may be described as outgoing towards our fellows. Which brings us to the third element of the Christian ideal, namely, *social service.* Obedience, fellowship, service: from these three words taken together we may gain a true and rounded conception of life's ideal. The Christian life may begin as a life of obedience, but sooner or later it must carry itself into the double channel of fellowship and service. Through fellowship with God comes the inspiration of obedience; through the service of humanity, its true fulfilment.

Surely we must welcome the new emphasis upon service in the modern statement of Christianity. The social ideal of our religion was largely lost sight of between the age of the Apostles and modern times, and only within recent years has it been recovered and freshly interpreted. Well it is that it has been. As men and women in the modern world, in which the social question presses, we should reject a religion that held no message of healing and hope for society, and for national and international life; that looked for no new social order on the earth for which it is our duty to labour. It is largely because the modern Christian Church as an organized institution has failed so far to strike the ethical or social note clearly enough, and to inspire its members with 'the enthusiasm of humanity' and the passion for humanitarian service, that so many spiritually minded men and women have been alienated from its fellowship.

It is then not God and self alone, but God and self and neighbour, that are at the making of true Christian personality. It needed the robbed and wounded Jew to make the Samaritan of the Parable what he is, namely, the Good Samaritan, the pattern for all time of brotherly love and service. He gave himself with his gifts, and he got a truer self back again. The true self is the fuller self. The more we merge our lives in the life and well-being of others, we receive them back again the richer and fuller. It is the grand paradox of personality, and part of the great truth of the social nature of all personal life—a truth to which modern thought has lent new meanings, but whose essential significance was grasped long ago by Him who said, 'He that loseth his life shall find it.'

Wherefore for the sake of the Kingdom of God as well as for the individual's sake we shall emphasize the importance of following the Christian ideal. Personal individuals are the units of the social order. 'It is in individual foci that the common life burns.' And the social order shall be redeemed only as its units reflect the Spirit of God and the

Mind of Christ. In sanctified and consecrated Christian personality lies the world's true hope.

Perhaps the most notable event in the theological world since the War has been the emergence of the Barthian school, whose leading exponents, besides Karl Barth, are Emil Brunner, Friedrich Gogarten, and Eduard Thurneysen. It is marked by a vigorous revival of the theology of the Reformers, expounded by men who are fully abreast of the critical and scientific thought of to-day. Its main points may be briefly indicated. It lays stress on the transcendence of God and the sinfulness and guilt of man. Revelation is God's gracious approach to man, not man's quest for God. Redemption is all of God; man has no power to redeem himself. All depends on faith and faith alone, but this faith becomes the most powerful, indeed the only real, ethical impulse. It should be added that these doctrines are expounded, not in the calm and detached spirit so characteristic of the critical theology of our time, but with a tremendous moral passion which at once arouses interest and carries conviction. To those who wish to make fuller acquaintance with the teachings of the Barthian school no better book can be recommended than *The Theology of Crisis*, by Professor H. Emil **Brunner** (Scribner's; 6s. net). Small in bulk, it is a garner full of the finest wheat. It makes much easier reading than Karl Barth's own work, and reveals **Brunner** as perhaps the best interpreter of the school.

In the introduction a strong plea is made for a return to serious theological thinking. 'Belief is the sap which creates the tree of life, with all its branches, big and little. . . . Among "Christians" and even among Christian theologians there are those who think that there are more urgent and practical tasks than that of theology, though theology has for its very problem the true understanding of human life. These people are like such gardeners as might think the branches of the tree more important than the sap because the branches are visible and the sap invisible.'

There follows some powerful and searching criticism of the theological thought of to-day, both Modernist and Fundamentalist. 'Christianity is either faith in the revelation of God in Jesus Christ or it is nothing. From this faith it derives its name, and has its peculiar content, its claim, its history. With it Christianity stands or falls. In the course of the last two centuries a process of transubstantiation has gone on which has resulted in something utterly distinct from Christian faith and theology. The science which is taught in most of our leading theological schools under the name of Christian theology ought rather to be called the science of religion. For the subject-matter is not the word of God, the revelation in Christ, but something totally different—religion, and perhaps revelation, in general. It seems very old-fashioned and unscientific to take theology in its original sense as the methodical study of the meaning of the word of God.' 'Truly, when the fundamentalists say that the modernists no longer hold the Christian faith, they are not far from telling the truth. . . . Modernism is by no means a newcomer in the realm of theology; it is even older than Christianity itself. It is essentially nothing more nor less than a repristination of later Platonism, either taking its form from the more ethically oriented Stoicism or from the Neoplatonic mysticism.'

The essence of this idealism is that man in the depths of his being is Divine, and that all he needs for salvation is the nurture of the Divine within him. If this be rejected as unchristian, are we driven back on the dilemma of being either scientific or Christian? **Brunner** holds that this dilemma is more apparent than real. 'Neither is the fundamentalist form of theology the same as Christian faith, nor is liberal Christianity truly scientific. Fundamentalism conflicts with science exactly because, and in so far as, it is not truly Christian; and liberal criticism is not truly Christian because, and in so far as, it is not truly critical. A third thesis may be added with propriety, namely, that only a Christian can be truly critical, and only he who is truly critical can be a Christian. The principles of true Christianity and of true criticism are identical. Fundamentalism is a petrification of Christianity, and modernism is its dissolution.'

Much modern thinking is blind to the fact of human sin and guilt. Liberalism has ever affirmed that the heart of man is *not* evil. Evil merely clings to man's heart, as the barnacles to the ship's hull. Man, therefore, may move upward towards God, and redemption is not really necessary. 'Modernism and fundamentalism are born of the same mother, that is, of the fear of sound critical thinking. But, let me add, this fear belongs to all of us. It is essentially part of the "old man"; nay, it is his very essence. It is the pride of the man who will not stand in the judgment of God, who will not concede that he is, really and wholly, a sinner, whose only salvation is the grace of God. Modernism digs itself in, before this unheard-of demand for confession of sin, behind an easy-going belief in the goodness of man and humanity; fundamentalism finds safety behind its orthodoxy and its ecclesiasticism.' But the truth must be faced. Man is a sinner, guilty before God and powerless to achieve his own salvation. The movement must come from God, and it does come in the Incarnate Word, the Lamb of God that taketh away the sin of the world. Man can but accept in faith the salvation which God has wrought in Christ. 'This apprehension of our helplessness and hopelessness and of the need and desire of deliverance, the New Testament calls repentance. Repentance is despair of self, despairing of self-help in removing the guilt that we have brought upon us. Repentance means a radical turning away from self-reliance to trust in God alone. Yes, to repent means to recognize self-trust to be the heart of sin.'

Does not this emphasis on man's helplessness tend to destroy moral initiative? This is the old ethical objection to the gospel of free grace. It might be sufficient to answer that history repels the objection. 'The times in which men expected nothing of themselves but everything of God were the epochs in which the greatest deeds were done.' Treating the point at more length, however, **Brunner** advances and defends the thesis that 'the *sola gratia, sola fide, soli deo gloria* of the Christian faith, that is, the Pauline view of faith, is the only solid foundation for ethics.' It is the only conception that goes to the root of the ethical problem. 'For morality is a matter of inner life and not of outward behaviour. All non-Christian ethics viewed from this central point is a sort of behaviourism, since it is more concerned with the action than the actor. To quote again a word of Luther: "It is not good works that make a good man, but a good man who does good works": that is, first the man and then his works; first the stand and power and then the leap; first the pure blood and then the healthy body; first the heart and then the acts.'

'One of the most fatal errors in the history of theology is the identification of the Biblical idea of the Kingdom with the rationalistic evolution and the optimistic theory of progress of the eighteenth century.' What has happened? The spirit of the West has absorbed the Christian faith. 'Instead of standing above the time process and so really dominating it, the Church, forgetting that her conversation is in heaven, has been dragged down into the world and is now driven about with its flotsam, and will ultimately, if this continues, become mere flotsam herself. In this fatal process the Kingdom of God plays a disastrous rôle. In modern theology and preaching it has been given a meaning directly opposite to that of the New Testament. . . . In the New Testament it means exactly that which man cannot do—the miracle by which God *ends* history and fashions His creation in ways and forms beyond imagination, beyond historical analogies, and beyond the reach of ethical attainment. It is a matter of faith and hope, and not of man's doing. Faith and hope, of course, are meant to have practical results—social, world-transforming effects. But they will bring this about only in proportion to the degree of their reality, that is, as they proceed from faith in God and not in man. Faith in God's doing is the salt of the earth which may preserve the world against decay and death. Faith in man is the salt that has lost its savour. It may be produced in large quantities by methods of social and educational psychology, but it is part of the world, and therefore cannot preserve it. No one will deny that we must have a live Church which has an actual word to speak in our muddled condition. But what is the use of a Church which, in order to be up-to-date, has ceased to be a Church? We are losing the foolishness of the gospel because we are ashamed of it; and we are substituting for it a modern religious ethical programme which seems to be better fitted to our generation, but which, in fact, is only the wisdom of man, has no moving power, and ends in mere fussiness.'

In a very suggestive article in the current *Congregational Quarterly* on 'The Doctrine of the Fallibility of Jesus,' the Rev. A. D. Martin deals with a subject of the most vital moment. Was Jesus fallible either religiously or morally? Let us not be in doubt as to the issue. If He is fallible, then the Catholic conception of His person goes, and with it His Divinity and His uniqueness and indeed Christianity as a religion and as we have received it.

Mr. Martin quotes Professor Kirsopp Lake, who says that as the infallible Bible has gone, and the infallible Church, so the infallible Jesus must go too, if only because of His apocalyptic (and erroneous) teaching, and His illusory expectation of the coming of the Kingdom of God. But the real purpose of Mr. Martin's article is to deal with Dr. C. J. Cadoux's recent book on 'Catholicism and Christianity' and the passages in it bearing on the authority of Jesus. Apparently Dr. Cadoux is a believer neither in the religious nor in the moral perfection of Jesus.

Mr. Martin takes up Dr. Cadoux's points one by one. Some of these may be omitted as plainly not vital. But there are others that are vital. One is Jesus' prediction that He would return 'on the clouds within the space of one generation.' Mr. Martin contends that the language of Jesus here, as elsewhere, was poetic and symbolic. The dream visions of *Enoch*, brilliantly imaginative descriptions of the heavenly world, can never have been meant to be taken literally. And this may be said of the apocalyptic literature generally. Why then literalize the words and pictures of Jesus? If His words are poetic and symbolic, then we can see also how great a *truth* His apocalyptic utterances contained.

It must be emphasized that if Jesus was mistaken in the main assertion He makes in these passages, then this mistake reveals a judgment that is not at one with the councils of God. 'Let us face facts,' says Mr. Martin. 'One of the amazing things to those of us who stand outside the high circles of scholarship, and claim no more than to be students of the New Testament, is the blindness or indifference of some great scholars to the consequences of their doctrines . . . the world will never be won into loyalty for a Lord who is shown to be a deluded enthusiast, however noble His sincerity and final martyrdom.'

Another question on which Dr. Cadoux finds the teaching of Jesus erroneous is that of eschatology, Gehenna fire and eternal punishment. This belief he stigmatizes as 'not only intellectually incredible, but morally outrageous.' Mr. Martin rather suggests that Dr. Cadoux is mistaken in thinking that Jesus actually held and taught this doctrine. Possibly. A case can be made out for that view. But even if He did hold it, is there not a great and solemn truth in the doctrine? If a soul clings to its sin, so that the sin becomes part of the fibre and being of the soul, can anything else than 'eternal punishment' describe its destiny? So long as a person holds to his sin, his suffering lasts. Sin and suffering are inseparable, and if a sinner goes on holding to his sin, he goes on suffering inevitably. To assert dogmatically that he must suffer only for a time is to deny any such thing as freedom. We are at liberty to sin, and go on sinning, and therefore eternal punishment is a dread possibility.

Mr. Martin turns from religious fallibility to moral imperfection. Dr. Cadoux doubts the sinlessness of Jesus. If He was sinless, why did He accept the baptism of repentance at John's hands? And why did He refuse to be called 'good' on the ground that only God can be good? And why did the author of Hebrews say that He 'learned obedience by the things that he suffered'? As to the last, it is surely obvious that the learning in Jesus' case did not imply disobedience. And that such an idea was far from the mind of the writer of Hebrews is clear from his own assertion that Jesus 'was in all points tempted like as we are yet without sin.'

The words of Jesus to the rich young ruler refusing the title 'good' are explained by Mr. MARTIN ingeniously. Jesus said that we have all only one Father—God, and that we are not to call any man father on the earth. If we are to be quite literal, like Dr. Cadoux, this would mean that no one was ever to call his parent 'father' again. But does any one imagine such literalism to be the truth? Surely it means that God is so ideal a Father that by a paradox no one else has the right to the title. The words 'why callest thou me good,' etc., are an exact parallel.

This is very interesting. But may a simpler explanation not suffice? Mr. MARTIN hints at this himself when he speaks of 'the perhaps glib salutation, *Good Master*.' If it was glib and facile, did not Jesus wish to test the spirit of the young man? He often did this: witness His severe words to the would-be disciples in Lk 9—'What do you mean by good?' And why do you call Me 'good'? One is good—God. Why do you use such a term to Me? If Jesus meant to test the youth, is not His language sufficiently explained? As to His acceptance of the Baptism of John, is not this explained by the desire of Jesus to be identified in every way with the sons of men?

But apart from details of this kind, the language of Jesus about Himself is quite incompatible with a sense of sin. He was always severe and exacting about the fulfilment of duty. His standard was very high, His demands very searching. Yet never once was He known to confess any fault in Himself, or (which is the very characteristic of sainthood) to acknowledge that only by the grace of God was He what He was. Contrast all this with St. Paul. And also remember the claim of Jesus, repeatedly made, that He Himself was to be the final Judge of men. Could such a claim be made by any sane being who knew Himself to be in any degree imperfect?

Mr. MARTIN has a fine passage in summing up the issue. Dr. Cadoux, after all his doubts and denials, would have us regard Jesus as uniquely Divine. But this is mere mental confusion, into which the plain man will refuse to be drawn. The only sense in calling Jesus Divine is to say something of Him which you can say of nobody else. The essence of the Divine is perfect holiness. That is what separates men (all men) from God. And that means an unfaltering will and a mind that harbours no unworthy thought. This is what we say of Jesus, that He *always* willed the good, that He enjoyed unclouded fellowship and oneness with the Father because He was one with the good.

There are many things in the Bible we may be disposed to hold as doubtful. We may doubt the historical accuracy of the Gospels in detail. We may even believe that the stories of the Lord's birth are not part of the original Apostolic tradition. But when we lay hands on the sacred ark, the unique, infallible, Divine nature of Jesus Christ, we take away that 'which leaves us poor indeed.' We take away the foundation of any gospel of the grace of God. Such a Saviour as Jesus Christ, the holy, the Divine, 'became us,' because He was 'separate from sinners.' And the giving of such a Saviour is infinitely becoming to God.

The title of a book has something to do with its fate. With an apt or arresting title, it has at least a chance to make its way among those whom it concerns. We are not sure that Mr. Robert J. HUTCHEON was wise in accepting the suggestion of his friends for the title of his book, *Frankness in Religion* (Macmillan; 10s. 6d. net), instead of boldly devising one for himself. As he truly says, the title indicates the spirit rather than the contents of the book. But we are sure that he could have improved upon this by the discovery of a title which would have done more justice to the contents and perhaps even to the spirit.

For we hasten to say that this is a first-rate book. It is more than frank—it is courageous, with just the sort of courage that is needed to-day by religious thinkers in view of the new atmosphere created not only by historical criticism—with that we have now been familiar for a good while—but by psychology. The writer believes that 'the great historical Christian system is in rapid decay': but while he is critical, he is also constructive. He has helpful suggestions to make at every point of his varied discussion, and they are all the more helpful because he is well aware that the ultimate problems of life cannot be solved by thought alone. The heart has its reasons as well as the head, and in any large estimate of life the one has as good a right to be heard as the other.

A list of a few of the subjects dealt with will show how comprehensive Mr. HUTCHEON's discussion is—'The Psychological Origin of Religion,' 'Revelation and Inspiration as Moments in the Creative Process,' 'Mysticism, its Limits and Present Possibilities,' 'Salvation as the Organization of Character,' 'What Makes the Bible Unique?' 'The Nature and Value of Faith,' 'The Person and Work of Jesus Christ,' 'The Meaning of God in Modern Thought,' 'Morality without Supernatural Sanctions.' The very titles suggest in some cases the courage and unconventionality of the treatment.

The book is in effect a criticism of the current or traditional conception of religion and a plea for a re-examination and re-expression of it more in accordance with the modern mind. This is a task which the Church for quite intelligible reasons has been reluctant to assume, but such a reluctance, if persisted in, may well alienate some of the noblest minds in the community. 'It is,' as Mr. HUTCHEON says, 'one of the immense calamities of history that the Church has been so conservative, so wedded to its ancient creeds, so unprogressive in its ethical program.'

Certainly no one will accuse Mr. HUTCHEON of timidity in his criticism or reconstruction. We need, he tells us, not only a new valuation of the Bible, but a new valuation of Jesus; and here are some of the challenging things he says in this connexion. 'We must make the Cross represent not merely the sacrifice of one heroic spiritual personality but the sacrifices for noble ends of all the spiritual heroes of all races and of all times' (p. 127). 'It is historically true that the Cross has concealed Jesus from the world rather than revealed Him' (p. 241). The Christian theologian 'has tied up his recognition of the spiritual greatness of Jesus to a theological dogma which has robbed Jesus of His real humanity. Hence, instead of regarding Jesus as the first among many brethren and thus doing justice to the original spiritual element in all noble men, he has made the many brethren too utterly dependent on the one great brother' (p. 256). Again, 'Paul's doctrine of the Cross is not a step in advance of Jesus or the prophets, but a step backward. It is an attempt to interpret the significance of Jesus in the terms of a system of thought which the prophets and Jesus repudiated' (p. 242); and the interminable theological controversies about the Person of Christ have deflected attention from His supreme value as 'a living example of the will to righteousness.'

All this is challenging enough, and Mr. HUTCHEON is well aware that any attempt at re-statement will be hotly resented by minds of the traditional sort. Nevertheless he pursues his way through his long argument with a fine sense of perspective and with a profound appreciation of the spiritual values which, in the end, are the things of ultimate importance to the traditionalists themselves. His reverence for Jesus, for example, is not a whit less than theirs. But in his re-statement he concentrates upon the prophetic quality of the Bible and gives short shrift to its ritual and sacerdotal aspects. 'Refine their [*i.e.* Protestant Fundamentalists] doctrine of the atonement through the blood of Christ as they may, it derives from the cultus and not from the ethical faith of the prophets.' Mr. Hutcheon is alive to 'The Values of Worship,' on which he writes an admirable chapter; but in his attitude to essential religion, he resolutely takes his place beside the prophet, not beside the priest.

It is interesting to compare his treatment of Mysticism with that of Professor Rufus M. Jones in his recently published volume on 'Some Exponents of Mysticism,' noticed elsewhere in this number. Mr. Hutcheon agrees with Professor Morgan that the mystic's profundity is 'a sham profundity.' The mystic is attempting to soar into regions inaccessible to man on his present level of being. The world into which the Bible introduces us is not the world into which we are ushered by the writings of the mystics. 'In attempting to transcend himself and the world the mystic only lands in the abyss.'

The challenges in which this book abounds are all inspired by a thoroughly constructive motive. It is because he has so supreme a regard for the spiritual values represented by religion that Mr. Hutcheon desires such an intellectual apprehension and expression—he would hardly say formulation—of them as will commend itself to the modern mind. Nothing, for example, could be more to the point than his salutary and far from unnecessary warning to teachers and students in theological schools. It is possible, he reminds them, to concentrate so severely upon questions of archæology, Biblical criticism, documentary analysis, the Synoptic problem, and so forth, as to leave little or no time for the presentation of the one thing which constitutes, after all, the *raison d'être* of the Bible, namely, 'the religious faith and moral passion which made the prophets and psalmists what they were.'

This is a stimulating and valuable book, especially searching on its psychological side. It will stir the blood of those who desire to play their part in the necessary task of clothing the great inheritance of the past in a modern dress. But far more than new formulations of truth, however admirably adapted to our own age, do we need a new access of life, a new elevation of spirit. Most of us will therefore agree with Mr. Hutcheon that 'the greatest need among educated circles is not for more knowledge but for more life, more kindling power, more moral drive, more confidence in moral ideals and more mystic fervour in presenting them to others.'

God and Mr. Middleton Murry.

By Charles E. Raven, D.D., Canon of Liverpool and Chaplain to the King.

Ever since the publication of Mr. William James' Gifford Lectures, the argument from mystic experience has been the refuge of the Christian apologist. The breakdown of the scholastic system with the triumph of the inductive method, the breakdown of Biblical Protestantism under the assaults of historical and critical study, the failure of constructive theologians to popularize the results of their labours, have combined to create bewilderment in the Churches. The reaction against materialism, the distrust of analysis, and of intellectualism, and the need for a restated religion, have opened the way to interest in the esoteric. In the appeal to a direct and unarguable conviction, such as mysticism claimed to supply, there seemed to be a sanctuary inviolable. A murmur of the word 'numinous,' a reference to Plotinus or St. Theresa, an allusion to the dark night of the soul—and we could dispense with the effort to think out our faith, and could justify any superstition by its power to evoke rapture.

It has long been evident to many of us that this relapse into the anti-rational would be short-lived or else disastrous. Far-sighted theologians, like

Dr. Tennant, warned us that we should 'do well to call nonsense by its name'[1]; or else, like Canon Quick,[2] rightly refusing this total rejection of mysticism, pleaded that such experience must be rigidly and scientifically tested. The warnings fell on deaf ears. It was safe to predict that having discovered so attractive a short-cut, we should follow it blindly until its safety was more popularly challenged. Mr. Middleton Murry, whatever the value of his book, has laid the advocates of a reasonable faith under a great obligation. His own reputation, the beauty, sincerity, and insight of his writing, his sympathetic, if mistaken, interpretation of Jesus and of Christianity should give his work a circulation which the Churches cannot ignore. It will not be easy in future to rely upon an unexamined mysticism.

For Mr. Murry, acknowledging Jesus as 'the New Man,' and admitting His uniquely creative influence, sets out to expound a philosophy on the basis of that high experience which he has shared with the mystics of all ages. He appreciates the value of this experience both for the individual and for religion; he repudiates the attempt to explain it away under the categories of physical or rationalistic concepts; he has a firm grasp upon wholeness of personality; he sees that man must live by inward constraint of his own nature and not by law imposed from without; he gives unstinted appreciation to the grandeur of Orthodox Christianity; he admits the organic unity and apparently the purposive order of the universe; but he parts company with God.

From the standpoint of non-Roman Christianity it might be sufficient to say that in his refusal to admit any Christianity except that of Rome, and in his quite unjustifiable assumption that the Christianity of Rome is the Christianity of Jesus, he has been guilty of an omission and an assertion which in combination vitiate his whole argument. If it is, as he maintains, foolishness or dishonesty to call oneself a Christian unless one accepts the Roman Catholic Church, there is no more to be said. Let us then find some other name for those who accept, as sincerely as any Roman, the religion of Jesus, and who by doing so differ as widely from Mr. Murry as from what he calls Christianity. We shall politely decline to accept his alternative, and shall regret that on certain pages[3] of his book he has written with a petulance unworthy of him or of his theme.

But it is not enough to protest that the dilemma in which he would place us is one of his own devising; that we refuse to admit the claim of Rome to be the sole and legitimate heir to Jesus; and that we do not find it necessary to accept his philosophy as an alternative. His book is far too fine to be brushed aside, even though in treating of Christianity it contains an obvious fallacy. For there are few who have perceived so plainly the real issue of our time, or have made so fine an attempt to understand and examine the significance of the vital core of religion.

Still less is it sufficient to point out that there is, despite his protests, nothing very new either in his experience or his philosophy. Very many of us have known such an event as he describes, and its resultant conviction of unity in the self and in the universe and of communion between them; and it is disappointing to find him claiming a singularity for his quite frequent type of illumination. Nor is his philosophy novel except in its terminology. The great Stoics, several of whom were evidently mystics, stressed as he does the duty of harmony between the self and the *anima mundi*, the need for wholeness and self-mastery, and the calm which is the reward of self-acceptance and self-sufficiency; and Epictetus has revealed the effects of such a faith in language at once warmer and more beautiful than Mr. Murry's. In recent times Auguste Comte has put forward a similar religion with a wealth of learning that Mr. Murry certainly does not possess. Nor is the special stress upon evolutionary emergence a new feature. Many recent volumes, such as Dr. Lloyd Morgan's *Life, Mind, and Spirit*, Professor Hocking's *The Meaning of God in Human Experience*, Professor Haldane's *The Sciences and Philosophy*, and Professor Whitehead's Gifford Lectures,[4] accept all the premises of Mr. Murry's work, have an equally clear experience, and a much wider knowledge, reject with him the crude dualism of supernatural and natural, and yet differ wholly from his conclusions. It is a pity that he should ignore such work and permit himself to accuse those who do not with him deny God either of ignorance—'they have not thought it out'—or of 'base equivocation.' But, again, the validity of his conclusions must not be dismissed without examination simply because, like other prophets, he overestimates his own originality, and has not made a full study of the work of others.

---

[1] *Philosophical Theology*, i. p. 321. Dr. Tennant in this section of his work gives an importance to the logical intelligence which is hardly consistent with his chapter upon Rationalism and Empiricism.

[2] Cf. his articles in *Theology*, Oct.–Dec. 1927.

[3] *E.g.* pp. 229–230, or p. 272.

[4] These are only typical; there is, of course, a very large literature covering the ground of Mr. Murry's volume.

In itself the book is based upon certain experiences in its author's life, poignant in themselves, and beautifully described, which qualify him as no amount of second-hand knowledge could do for the task of interpreting religion. He has been down into hell, the hell of loneliness and agony, and spiritual inanition. He has been rapt into heaven, the heaven of realized unity. He condemns all materialistic or behaviourist attempts to explain away his experience; and all mechanical, legalistic, dualistic, or ecclesiastical schemes of conduct and 'philosophies' of life. He sets himself to examine and test his experience and interpret it in naturalistic and organic concepts. He produces a result which he believes to cover all the data, to give a full appreciation of Jesus and Christianity, to expose the grounds on which men have created God, and to advance beyond the need for Him. He admits that only those who have shared his experience will understand his position, or accept his denials. But quite evidently he has reached an honest conclusion, and finds it sufficient and satisfying as well as, for himself, intellectually necessary. There is in him nothing of shallow or facile rebellion; no desire to be shocking or clever or literary; no sign of affectation or of wilful self-delusion. He 'can no other'; and as such, and because he deals reverently with matters of supreme importance, he deserves the gratitude of careful consideration.

It is abundantly plain from his misinterpretation of the Messiahship of Jesus [1] that his own temperament is of the twice-born order. He reached his illumination in recoil from a period of intense suffering and inward strife. He claims that this is the normal preparation for mystic experience. In so doing I believe he is profoundly mistaken. Rapture of this order is not the highest type of mysticism; it has in it a large element that is obviously pathological; and its results cannot be accepted as conclusive however carefully they be scrutinized. For in such cases the organism has been subjected to an intolerable strain; it snaps; an overwhelming relief is the immediate result. It does not necessarily follow that the consequent sense of unity is unreal or illusory; but it is certainly a relatively low type, as compared with that which emerges from a period of sublimation and integration. In Mr. Murry's case this verdict is confirmed by his admissions, first, that his mystic experience is indistinguishable in its awareness of an all-pervading Unity from that produced by anæsthetics; [2] and secondly, that whereas his former experience produced a conviction of the reality of God, it was only after the anæsthetic that he saw clearly that God was an illusion.[3] I have examined at some length, and summarized elsewhere,[4] the evidence of the relationship of genuine to artificially induced mysticism; and the conclusion appears to be that though a measure of unification can be produced under the influence of ether or hashish or alcohol, when the psychic state is simplified by the suppression of its contacts, this is a vastly different experience from that which occurs when every element of the personality at its fullest is brought into unity. Mr. Murry's type of rapture is admittedly more akin to the former than to the latter; it is attained by exhaustion at the end of a period of ascetic renunciation, not by the emergence of a new level of vitality upon a psychic state of full and harmonious enlargement. The higher ranges of personality are disclosed when every vital power is at its highest, not when the self is drugged or devitalized.

The first criticism to be passed upon the book is therefore that the data on which its conclusions are based are inadequate. They are not evidence for humanity at its highest.

Mr. Murry seems conscious of this; for he desires to base his philosophy upon grounds other than those supplied by his mysticism. He would defend the wholeness of the self, the relationship between its unity and the organic unity of the universe as true, even apart from their verification in mysticism. Here much of what he has to say is quite admirable. He describes with real insight the relation between the whole self and the intellect; he deals faithfully with the rationalist who thinks that he can simplify life into a logical schema, or interpret it by materialistic or mechanistic analogies, and not less faithfully with the Christian who introduces the supernatural in order to redress the defects of the natural. He is right in insisting that all is natural, that the pure ego is not amenable to complete intellectual formulation, that man must learn to live in response to the constraint of his own whole self and not by rule and rote, that the universe is so ordered that this which seems like anarchy is in fact its opposite and the means of true progress. All this, of course, many of us who call ourselves Christians have been saying even more unequivocally than he; and it was said implicitly and explicitly both by Jesus and by St. Paul. But along with it there is much on which he is vague, while they are definite; and something that he denies and they affirm. For us these are the issues of principal moment.

---

[1] This mistake will be obvious to any close student of the New Testament; it is not relevant to the main thesis of his book, and is therefore not discussed here.

[2] P. 129.

[3] P. 315, as compared with p. 121.

[4] *Creator Spirit*, pp. 244–247.

His vagueness is most manifest in his treatment of what he calls 'the organic unity of the Universe.' In certain places he speaks of this as perhaps better described as 'the biological unity of life,' and apparently means by it nothing more than that between matter, life, and consciousness there is a continuity, and that we must interpret the Universe as the expression of a single order of being. This, if this is all, is certainly a minimal interpretation of the mystic's apprehension, and of Mr. Murry's organic unity. It fails to give any account of the characteristic conviction of every mystic that the universe is not merely one but friendly, and that he is in communion with it. It needs no mysticism, but only an elementary common sense to maintain as much as this.

But there are many phrases, apparently essential to his argument, in which he seems to mean far more than this. 'We believe that the Universe as organic unity striving after self-creation through the individual . . . is a satisfying object of contemplation' is, of course, a confession exactly appropriate to Mr. Wells' 'struggling god.' When he assigns to the Universe an 'inherent organic urge towards newness,'[1] and when he states that 'the world-organism is so admirably devised that those who might be depraved by it' (by the doctrine that man is not a moral being) 'will not believe it,'[2] he ascribes to this organism a purpose and plan of its own, wholly independent of man or of mankind. Here he approaches that analogy between the microcosm and the macrocosm which led the Stoics to their concept of the Logos or Pneuma in the Universe, and but for the archaic materialism which they borrowed from Heracleitus would have transformed a rather barren metaphysic into an authentic if tenuous religion.[3] He is indeed on the verge of becoming theistic, when he states his faith in one 'too vast to be my friend, too intimate to be my enemy,'[4] one 'mysterious and vast, mighty and intimate.'[5] Realizing that such a being is not unlike God, he shows signs of an eminently unmetabiological exasperation[6]—a sure proof that he is not quite sure how far he has committed himself.

We do not propose to incur his threatened wrath by suggesting that, if pressed, his admissions would convict him of theism. Rather we agree that the organic unity of the Universe forced upon him by experience is kept so subsidiary to what is without it pure positivism, as to be unworthy of the name of God. Certainly, in the sense in which we speak of God, he is a God-denier; for to him the organic unity of the Universe is only a means to his own self-integration. Religion cannot be satisfied with a creed so evidently self-centred. Mr. Murry's goal is self-acceptance, the Christian's goal is love; between the two there is the difference between the centripetal and the centrifugal, between Lucifer and Jesus.

Yet by his vagueness about the Universe, Mr. Murry in fact vitiates his claim to provide a coherent and inclusive philosophy. When he states: 'If the insistence upon God becomes more serious, we meet it not with a mere refusal, but with an insuperable difficulty. The new calculus explains God, but God cannot explain the new calculus. The new calculus includes the old; the old does not include the new,'[7] his statement must be sharply challenged. He allows the existence and objectivity of the Universe: he is no solipsist or subjective idealist; yet he brushes aside all the problems as to its origin and nature, its order and purpose, as if they did not exist. Now it may well be that the old arguments, ontological, cosmological, and teleological, do not amount to demonstration; the form in which they have been traditionally stated is open to serious criticism; but it is certainly unjust to claim that the new includes the old, when the new makes no attempt whatever to take these huge questions into its purview. It is very easy for Mr. Murry with these judicious omissions to suggest that we can 'dispense with God when we can carry his burden.' Does he seriously suppose that we can carry the burden of the creation, maintenance, ordering, and purposive movement of the Universe? He admits order and purpose in the nature of things; he neither explains them in terms of organism, nor could do so without lapsing into theism. Presumably he is content to be agnostic in these matters; if so, he cannot claim inclusiveness for his calculus. If the Universe is an organism, its organic life is certainly not the life of the creatures domiciled within it, and an integral part of it. There must be some *élan vital* at least; some power not ourselves that makes if not for righteousness, at any rate for wholeness; 'where wast thou when I laid the foundations of the earth? declare if thou knowest' is still a challenge that cannot be airily ignored.

---

[1] P. 176; cf. p. 233.

[2] P. 298.

[3] This change is actually made by some of them, *e.g.* in the hymn of Cleanthes.

[4] P. 74.

[5] P. 281.

[6] P. 277.

[7] P. 280.

It is indeed curious that a book claiming to provide a complete and coherent philosophy should be utterly silent upon matters with which every philosopher hitherto has found himself compelled to deal. The *De natura rerum* is a poem which Mr. Murry quotes; he dismisses Lucretius' solution, as he does all materialistic interpretations. Yet beyond a somewhat imaginative sketch of Lamarckianism, he provides no sort of substitute. Only two paragraphs, so far as I can discover, deal with the issue at all, and these contradict one another. In one he states: 'It is impossible for the intellect to conceive how that supremely personal God who is the sum and harmony of all human perfections can be responsible for the world of pain and imperfection that we know'[1]—a dogmatic statement which occurs in a section describing Christianity, but which he repeats in altered language later in the same chapter.[2] In the other, after admitting that 'if the real really is horrible, then assuredly luckless humanity is perfectly justified in erecting the ideal to nullify it,'[3] he goes on to point out that 'the real has contained many very wonderful achievements of man, heroisms, beauties, imaginations, and inventions. It enables these wonderful emergences to endure.'[4] For such a world it is surely not impossible to regard God as responsible. I think Mr. Murry, if he had thought it out, might admit that as he could accept such a world, God might do so too. Admittedly the problem is hard; but no complete philosophy can dismiss it with a dogmatic assertion.

It is not, however, enough for us to show that Mr. Murry is mistaken in claiming completeness for his scheme. Certainly, without facing such issues, he has fully understood the need for God, and is therefore on his own showing not yet justified in dispensing with Him. Nevertheless he might still be right so far as he goes; and if so, though we might keep room for God to explain the organic unity of the Universe, God will be only a 'First Cause,' an *élan de vie*, a principle of creative emergence. If the testimony of mankind, if the heart and mind of man have no use for Him except to bear the burden of causality, He will certainly mean less to us than He meant to Jesus; and we may be left with self-acceptance instead of loving worship as our goal.

Our final task, therefore, is to turn to the field in which Mr. Murry is most at home, and to ask whether in point of fact the interpretation of mystic experience, on which his whole case really rests, is adequate. Is his mysticism the supreme type of such experience? Is his account of it sufficient to explain, for example, the mysticism of Jesus? And if not, how far does this defect invalidate his findings?

It has already been argued that, in fact, a mysticism induced as the result of long mental and emotional conflict is of a relatively low type. The records of mystics are full of cases of this sort where sheer exhaustion, often deliberately achieved by a discipline of ascetic rigour, by self-torture, or by prolonged devotional exercises, is followed by an ecstasy. The methods of purgation can be studied in detail, and have been elaborated into a regular technique, and it is possible to detect various levels both of preparation and of consequent experience. The lowest grade would seem to be that produced by drugs or anæsthesia where the cutting off of sensuous consciousness establishes a dream-state giving a vague apprehension of unity, but often broken by phantasies and nightmares. Next, there is the rapture attained through intense concentration on a crystal or a light, or the monotonous repetition of a formula, when unification is reached by the diminution and focussing of the field of awareness. Next to this comes the ecstasy of exhaustion when the conscious life, worn out by suffering or by a fierce struggle between animal passions and moral control, sinks into lassitude. The process is analogous to, and perhaps connected with, the operation of the sympathetic nerve upon acute physical pain. When torpor has been reached, the resulting calm floods in upon the sufferer as an intense and beatific release. The tortured self recovers the sense of its own unity, and an overwhelming conviction that all is well. I have examined a number of cases similar to that of Mr. Murry, and find abundant testimony to the accuracy of his description; and in most of them a definite conviction of the reality of God, a conviction interpreted as a swooning into peace and security, a sinking into the embrace of the infinite. I hesitate to describe such experiences as merely pathological; for, like Mr. Murry, I believe that if carefully tested and freed from the hallucinations which often accompany them they have a real validity. Their intensity, enhanced as it is by contrast with what has gone before, is for the recipient compelling and revolutionary. Here is indeed a new birth. But they belong to the level of passive mysticism, where the dominant impression is of the unity and changeless quietude of the universe, apprehended as a living organism, of which the mystic is an integral part, and in which he can rest secure.

---

[1] P. 224.

[2] P. 231.

[3] P. 307.

[4] P. 308.

Some will maintain that this and this only should be called mysticism, and that more active states ought to be given another name—perhaps that of inspiration. In reality this passive experience seems merely a lower level of what is at a higher stage creative and dynamic. For beyond the mysticism of exhaustion is the mysticism of sublimation, the experience that emerges when the whole self is fully integrated and alert, and is then possessed and energized by a power transcendent and evidently universal, yet akin and intimately united with itself. Mr. Murry is by temperament and profession a critic, detached, judicious, and on his own admission self-centred and somewhat inhuman. It is possible that he has had little or no acquaintance with the creative artist's rapture or the inspiration of the man of genius. Yet these are indisputably of a mystic type, and supervene not upon morbidity but, as Nietzsche has insisted, upon 'a great healthiness.'[1] Nietzsche is, I conclude, a witness whom Mr. Murry will accept, so it may be worth quoting his exposition of his own creative activity. 'The idea of revelation in the sense that something which profoundly convulses and upsets one becomes suddenly visible and audible with indescribable certainty and accuracy—describes the simple fact. One takes—one does not ask who gives. There is an ecstasy so great that the immense strain of it is sometimes relaxed by a flood of tears. There is a depth of happiness in which the most painful parts do not act as antithesis to the rest, but are required as necessary colour in such an overflow of light. Everything happens quite involuntarily, as if in a tempestuous outburst of freedom, of absoluteness, of power and divinity. This is my experience and inspiration.'[2]

Instances might be multiplied almost indefinitely of this type of rapture, ranging from a simple conviction that words or actions are 'given' to the supreme achievements of the *Gott-betronken* and of the Incarnate. A graduated series can easily be constructed here as in passive mysticism. Many of us have felt at moments of high vitality, the breaking in upon us of a visitant who possesses and thrills of a universal life, not our own, which has about it the quality of personality. Examining such moments, we can see that there has been a preparatory period of purgation bringing the personality into tone, and capable of being described and consciously followed. The experience itself is less catastrophic, but certainly not less convincing. It is no mere swooning into the peace of the infinite, but the inbreathing of one who fills and floods us with his energy, lifts us on to a plane of being far above our own level, and controls us irresistibly, so that we become for a span the instruments of His will. The higher grades of initiate are still more conscious alike of the grandeur and of the personality of the power that inspires them. There is here more than organic unity: it is unity; it is organic: but it is friend, comrade, lover, and that not by any imaginative hypostatization, but by the evidence of the character of the experience. Such mystics receive all that Mr. Murry describes of illumination, of security, of unity within, and unity between them and the universe; but the agent of their inspiraton is no passive comforter, but active, demonic, divine; and its effect is not a quiet glow of recovered confidence, but an ardour of intense and throbbing rapture. In their hour they are possessed by a passion of creativeness; there emerges in them a new birth; they are men transfigured, every faculty being raised to its highest power, attuned to a harmony of poised and effective energy, and then charged with the influx of acknowledged Deity. In them the universal finds expression; through them God manifests Himself. Moreover, and this is the point of chief importance, the worth of their inspiration, because expressed in action, can be tested in its effects by the ordinary methods of critical judgment.

It is impossible to study the evidence for the higher ranges of human experience without recognizing that mystics of Mr. Murry's type do not gain enough from their ecstasy to speak clearly, and often remain self-centred. For themselves their experience may be valid; but the rest of us can only appreciate it indirectly by studying its influence upon them. Those of a more positive and healthy order are not only far more definite as to the quality and 'values' of the Universal, but, once having known rapture, escape from primary concern about themselves and their own significance. The almost morbid anxiety which Mr. Murry shows concerning the worth of his book, or its originality as a 'new metabiological variation,' is utterly unlike the freedom of the active mystic, and would of itself raise the suspicion that his liberation had not been complete. The higher mystics are not troubled about their own madness or sanity; they are not thinking about themselves; they have lost their lives and found them in the life of that which has possessed them; they care about God and other people; they seek not to do their own will, but the will of Him that sent them; they are men utterly dedicated. They are creative; and their creations await our criticism: the tree can be judged by its fruits. Like Mr. Murry they seek wholeness, not goodness nor any lesser thing, but it is wholeness not in the integrated unity of their own personalities, but in the unity of the universal; and because they seek that which is outside themselves they achieve their own fulfilment on the way. Those who would escape the futilities of the self-involved, those who would develop their 'pure personality' to the uttermost, will not do so until they have ceased to be the centres of their own interest. 'Seek ye first God's kingdom and righteousness' is a higher precept than 'Accept thyself': it is also vastly more effective.

---

[1] *Ecce homo*, p. 96. Cf., for this and many other instances, J. Y. Simpson, *Landmarks in the Struggle between Science and Religion*, pp. 61–74.

[2] *Loc. cit.* p. 96 ff.

Of this high type of mystic Jesus is a unique example. By His own admission, by the evidence of His character, by the testimony of His followers, 'in Him was God.' None can question that His whole activity was dominated by the conviction of God's reality, of God's perfection, of God's love, and of God's accessibility. Few men have paid a finer tribute to His creative influence or human splendour than Mr. Murry; and, in addition, he admits that living in the first century Jesus could have given no other account of Himself or of the Universe than what He gave. If, as we believe, His life was even more consistent and majestic than our author will allow, if, as we have argued, His total consecration to the doing of the Father's will raises His character and His mystical union above the level of all others, and differentiates Him as God-centred from all who find their centre in self-acceptance, we cannot but maintain that those who saw in Him the image of the invisible God were justified. It was right and inevitable that He should be acknowledged as God incarnate. When, under the influence of other and perhaps irreconcilable concepts of deity, the Church went on to detach Him from the natural order and formulate a doctrine of His person in terms of an antithesis between natural and supernatural, it was, in fact, falling away from its own confession. Such an antithesis, though accepted by Catholic Orthodoxy and approved by Mr. Murry, is fundamentally opposed alike to the mystic experience, to the teaching of Jesus, and to belief in an incarnation. We cannot be true to both Jesus and to such a dualism. It is because he does not realize this that Mr. Murry's dilemma, either Catholicism and Jesus as divine, or the total denial of Christianity, is based upon a fallacy.

National Contributions to Biblical Science.

III. The Contribution of Germany to Old Testament Study.

By Professor A. R. Gordon, D.D., United Theological College, Montreal.

This contribution has been as wide as it is deep. It covers the whole range of study, from grammar and lexicography to the 'weightier matters' of faith and life. Instead, however, of splitting the subject into various sections, which would produce little more effect than that of a catalogue, I have thought it better to concentrate upon a few outstanding personalities, the beacon lights through whom the main lines of advance have been guided from one generation to another.

The decisive impulse to a genuine study of the Old Testament was given by Luther, when he brushed away the cobwebs of scholastic exegesis—its prevailing idea of the manifold sense of Scripture, and its extravagant and tasteless allegorizing—and insisted on 'one simple, appropriate, certain, literal sense,' understood in the light of the context, taking into account times, circumstances, and conditions, and having due regard to the 'proportion of faith,' that is, the place of the passage in the perspective of the revelation of God in Christ. These broad principles of interpretation, it will be seen, contain the germs of what was to develop into textual, historical, literary, and spiritual criticism.

The freedom thus won by Luther was soon lost in a recrudescence of dry scholasticism, which treated the Scriptures no longer as the bread and water of life, but as a quarry of proof-texts for the buttressing of rival creeds, giving too good ground for Werenfels' epigram:

> This is a book in which each one seeks his own dogmas,
> And in which likewise each one finds his own dogmas.

Deliverance from the bondage of bibliolatry came from two very diverse quarters, evangelical piety and Biblical criticism. The two influences were most happily combined in the leading Biblical scholars of the eighteenth century: men like Spener, the father of Pietism, who prayed God to save men from 'interpreting Scripture according to creeds, and so erecting a veritable popedom in the midst of the Church'; Bengel, the author of the incomparable *Gnomon*, whose first principle of interpretation was 'Put nothing into the Scriptures, but draw the full meaning out of them, suffering nothing that is in them to remain hid'; and Ernesti, author of the standard *Elements of Interpretation*, who proceeded from the assumption, 'Of course the Scriptures are to be investigated by the same rules as other books.' No one, however, did more to open men's minds to the Divine beauty and truth of the Bible, especially the Old Testament, than Herder, the poet-preacher of Weimar. A man of unusual sensibility, he was from his earliest years fascinated by the poetry of the Bible, 'with its tenderness, its grave wisdom, and its solemnity.' His later variety of interests only intensified his love for the Bible, which for him remained the crown of all literature and the fountain of eternal life. But, he urged, 'The best way to read this Divine book is the human—taking that word in its broadest sense and its most vital significance. The more humanly you read the Word of God, the closer you come to the mind of its Author, who formed man in His image, and in all the deeds of power and grace in which He reveals Himself as our God works for us in human wise.' From this human standpoint Herder wrote two books which have had a far-reaching influence on Old Testament study: his charming *Songs of Love* (1778), a new version of the Song of Songs, arranged, with rare prescience of the trend of recent criticism, as forty-four independent love-songs, held together 'by no closer link than that of a bunch of fine pearls on one string,' and his classical work on *The Spirit of Hebrew Poetry* (1782), a kind of rhapsody on the poetry of the Old Testament—'the poetry of friendship between man and God'—which is still unequalled for insight into the heart and soul of that literature.

Herder's work was inspirational rather than scientific. It was necessary, therefore, that the intuitions of his genius should be supplemented by keen, penetrating criticism based on thorough knowledge of Hebrew and its cognate languages. This contribution was made in masterly fashion by his friend Eichhorn, whom Cheyne has justly described as 'the founder of modern Old Testament criticism.' Eichhorn was prepared for his task by a liberal course of studies in Classical and Oriental literature, while his general culture was stimulated by his friendship with Herder and Goethe. His great *Introduction to the Old Testament* (1780–1783) is a fine combination of critical acumen and literary feeling. It is in this book that the distinction is first drawn between Lower Criticism, which concerns itself with problems of the text, and Higher Criticism—'a new name to no humanist'—which deals with the more complex questions of authorship, composition, and date. Eichhorn's main contribution to Higher Criticism was his rediscovery of the key which Astruc had first applied to the solution of the problem of Genesis, viz. the alternation of the Divine names Jahweh and Elohim, though he saw that literary considerations were equally involved in the problem, and analysed the book in a far more constructive way than Astruc had done. He had also a clear perception of the later date of books like Deutero-Isaiah, Esther, Ecclesiastes, and Daniel. To this was added a warm appreciation of the qualities of the literature. This appreciation was, no doubt, more æsthetic than religious. All the more on that account did it appeal to the romantic tendencies of the age. Of Eichhorn, no less truly than of Herder, it might be said, in Dorner's words, that he 'reconquered, so to speak, the Old Testament for German literature.'

Eichhorn's work had the defects of its merit. Often a robe of rhetoric veiled a lack of thoroughness and accuracy. In these respects Eichhorn found his true counterpart in his illustrious pupil Gesenius. His nature was more rationalistic than poetic. He loved exactitude in detail rather than broad literary effects. Though he lectured on the whole field of Old Testament literature, his real interest was in linguistics. His contribution to this department of study was of fundamental importance. His *Hebrew Grammar* (first published in 1813), followed by his exhaustive *Syntax of the Hebrew Language* (1817), and especially his *Hebrew-*

German Dictionary (1812), which appeared in a new form as the *Manual Lexicon* (1833), and was finally expanded into the monumental *Thesaurus philologicus criticus* (1826–58), laid a solid basis for all future study of Hebrew, and in successive revisions are still standard works in all our Colleges.

Gesenius' sole contribution to exegesis was his *Commentary on Isaiah* (1820–21), a work of immense erudition, sane and balanced in judgment, with a sure grasp of the prophet's function as 'a herald and watchman of the theocracy and the theocratic faith,' though from his rationalistic standpoint he quite failed to do justice to the prophet's religious idealism.

The qualities so conspicuously wanting in Gesenius were richly supplied by Eichhorn's still more illustrious pupil, Heinrich Ewald, that erratic, arbitrary, dogmatic, but singularly arresting and inspiring figure. Ewald had a real gift of divination, and a dæmonic energy of purpose. As a youth he had caught from Herder and Eichhorn the spell of the East, and he felt called to be a prophet of the light that shone from the East. In preparation for his task he flung himself into philological studies of a wide variety of Oriental tongues, especially Arabic, which he rightly judged to be the necessary key to the understanding of Hebrew language and literature. Apart from his quixotic sally into the field of Hexateuchal criticism —an essay on the *Composition of Genesis*, which he published in 1823, at the early age of nineteen— his first contributions to scholarship were treatises on Arabic and Sanskrit metres, followed at a short interval by Hebrew and Arabic Grammars, which already showed his native genius. Gesenius had been content to set the forms of speech in clear, dry light; Ewald sought to reduce them all to their underlying principles. Thus even in dealing with the rudiments he breathed the breath of life into the dead bones.

With this equipment Ewald embarked on the true work of his life, the interpretation of the literature, history, and religion of the Bible. He began, significantly enough, with the poetical books of the Old Testament, on the ground that in them we are brought most directly to the fountain-heads of spiritual life in Israel. The series opened in 1826 with an exposition of the Song of Songs as a drama of true love tried and triumphant—a theory which is still supported, with modifications, in Driver's *Introduction* and Rothstein's article in the *Dictionary of the Bible*. This was followed in 1835 by the illuminating Commentary on Psalms; within another year the noble volume on Job appeared; and next year Proverbs and Ecclesiastes were added. In 1839 Ewald published his general reflections on Hebrew poetry, which broke new ground along various lines. From this point of vantage he passed on to a study of the loftier inspiration of the prophets. His *Commentary on the Prophetic Books* (1840–41) is unquestionably his exegetical masterpiece. The subject was congenial. Himself possessed of a real measure of the prophetic spirit, he loved to portray the prophets as men who spoke the truth of God as they felt it in their own hearts and lives. Ever intent on his purpose, he next entered the New Testament field, and wrote a series of books on the Synoptic Gospels, the Johannine literature, and the Epistles of St. Paul, in violent opposition to Strauss and Baur. Meanwhile he had been revising his first crude views on Hexateuchal criticism. Taking up the problem where Eichhorn left it, he carried his principles of analysis right through the Pentateuch and Joshua, assigning the contents of these books to the four sources now generally recognized by Old Testament scholars, though unhappily he insisted on treating the priestly element (P) as the *Urschrift* or 'original document,' belonging to the early years of Solomon's reign, and the more popular Elohistic and Jahwistic narratives (E and J) as mere 'supplements,' ranging from a date soon after Solomon to the end of the ninth or the beginning of the eighth century B.C. The pioneer attempt of Vatke in his *Biblical Theology* to relegate the priestly element to the Exile he dismissed with scant courtesy; and the later works of Graf and Kayser in support of this thesis he seems to have passed over in silence. On these foundations, then, Ewald built his imposing *History of Israel* (1843–59). This work is as vast in design as it is massive in structure. It covers, in seven large volumes, the whole period of the history, from its dim beginnings to the fall of Jerusalem in A.D. 70. It has, no doubt, obvious faults. Apart from the insecurity of its foundations, it suffers from a lack of proportion. It is also shot through with diatribes against his enemies, both personal and national. Notwithstanding these defects, it is the work of a great creative spirit. Ewald has an artist's eye for the personalities of the Bible; and he paints them with an artist's brush. Above all, he has a fine sense for the religious significance of the whole. To him the history of Israel is a revelation through men of the mind and will of God, a revelation broadening and deepening to the perfect revelation in Christ.

Of the many distinguished scholars trained in

Ewald's school, Julius Wellhausen was his true spiritual heir. Temperamentally, indeed, the two men were poles apart. Wellhausen was as sober and judicious as Ewald was hot-headed and wilful. The pupil, however, had much of the master's insight, and all of his reverence for the Scriptures as an oracle from the living God. Like Ewald, he prepared himself for his life's work by intensive studies in Arabic and other Semitic languages. He also dug deep in the field of textual criticism. His first important work was his treatise on *The Text of the Books of Samuel* (1869), where the principles of textual criticism were laid down by a firm, sure hand, and Old Testament scholarship was enriched by a series of what Driver calls 'most successful and happy emendations of the text.' Had Wellhausen continued along this line, he would have become our foremost textual critic. His main interest, however, was in the history and religion of Israel. For really constructive work in this sphere he felt he must lay surer foundations than Ewald had done. It was this impulse that led him to his epoch-making studies in Hexateuchal criticism. He was from the first profoundly dissatisfied with Ewald's arrangement of the documents. Learning through Ritschl that Graf placed the Law later than the Prophets, he was prepared to accept the hypothesis, 'almost without his reasons for it,' and boldly struck out in the direction thus suggested. The first-fruits of his labour appeared in the famous articles on *The Composition of the Hexateuch* (1876–77), in which he definitely committed himself to the Grafian 'heresy.' His reason for so doing he stated in succinct form in his revised edition of Bleek's *Introduction* (1878): 'The decision of the question rests on this, that JE knows nothing of unity of worship in Israel, Deuteronomy postulates it as a new institution that had not hitherto existed, while the Priestly Code presupposes it as having existed and been developed to its fullest consequences, as a matter of course, from the very beginning.' The *Prolegomena*, which appeared the same year, confirms this general statement by a broad survey of the literature of the Old Testament. On this basis rests the *History of Israel and Judah* (1894). The book is planned on quite a different scale from Ewald's *History*. While it covers the same range, it contains less than 400 pages. Unencumbered by critical details, it moves easily over the ground, tracing in vivid and often brilliant outlines the political, social, and religious developments of the history. Here, too, the stress is laid on the great spiritual movements and personalities. Among others, the sections on Amos and Jeremiah, Jewish piety, and the Gospel have become classical.

Apart from his translation of Psalms in the *Sacred Books of the Old Testament*, and his brief but illuminating *Minor Prophets*, Wellhausen's later work was mainly in the field of Arabic history and religion. His most important contribution to this subject is his small volume entitled *Reste arabischen Heidentums* (1897), a collection and interpretation of the survivals of Arabian paganism, with penetrating applications to religious movements in Israel, the most suggestive part of the volume being his explanation of primitive sacrifice as a rite of 'communion with God'—the theory which is worked out with such a wealth of learning in Robertson Smith's *Religion of the Semites*.

Wellhausen's influence has been profound and far-reaching. For a full generation he dominated the Old Testament scholarship of two continents. In his own land he inspired, more or less directly, the Hexateuchal criticism of Budde, Smend, Holzinger, and especially Eissfeldt, in his recent *Hexateuch-Synopse*; the leading commentaries of the period, such as those of Holzinger on Genesis and Exodus, Steuernagel on Deuteronomy, Budde on Judges and Samuel, Duhm on Isaiah, Jeremiah, and the Minor Prophets, Marti on Isaiah and the Minor Prophets, Cornill on Jeremiah, Kraetzschmar and Herrmann on Ezekiel, and Nowack on the Minor Prophets; the standard Introductions to the Old Testament of Steuernagel, König, and Cornill; the Histories of Israel by Stade and Guthe; the stimulating studies of the prophets by Duhm and Hölscher; and the constructive expositions of the Religion of Israel by Schultz, Smend, Stade, Bertholet, König, and Kautzsch.

In all Wellhausen's work there is a crystalline clearness and sharpness of edge. One is conscious, however, of a certain lack of atmosphere and background. He approaches his subject from the standpoint of the literary critic, and too often he fails to do justice to the life behind the literature. Moreover, while he has an open eye for the Arabian origin of much of the Israelite tradition, he has little appreciation of the streams of influence that flowed in from surrounding nations, as these are being so copiously revealed by the results of excavation in Palestine and other Oriental countries. In these two respects his work is fittingly complemented by that of the 'historical school.' The first sign of the times was Gunkel's *Schöpfung und Chaos* (1894), which traced the influence of the Babylonian myth of Tiamat all through the Bible. But the most influential pioneering work along the new lines was his great

Commentary on Genesis, the first edition of which was published in 1901. This Commentary is as keenly critical as Wellhausen's *Composition*. The main feature of the work, however, is the attempt to get beyond the literary sources to the popular traditions enshrined in them, and to relate these to the parallel Babylonian, Egyptian, and cognate traditions. The whole treatment, too, is suffused by a richness of colour like that of the dawn, and by a warmth of religious feeling which is as refreshing as it is rare in a critical commentary. The same qualities characterize the *Göttingen Bible*, a work of popular exposition by Gunkel and the leading members of his school. Gunkel's contribution to this series is confined to the exposition of Genesis and introductions to the Greater Prophets. Of recent years he has applied himself with special interest to the prophetic and poetical books of the Old Testament, his latest achievement being his *Commentary on the Psalms* (1926), which is still richer in spiritual sympathy than his *Genesis*. Here also his aim is to trace the literary products to their origin in the spoken and sung word, and to set the whole in the context of contemporary Oriental civilization. He is thus able to assign considerable portions of the prophetic literature, and many of the Psalms, to an earlier date than the literary critics had allowed.

The most brilliant of the younger members of the historical school was Hugo Gressmann, whose untimely death in 1927 was an irreparable loss to Old Testament scholarship. Gressmann established his literary fame at an early age by his *Ursprung der israelitisch-jüdischen Eschatologie* (1905), a bold attempt to show that the prophets of Israel were dominated by eschatological conceptions drawn mainly from Babylonian and Egyptian mythology —a theory which enjoyed some vogue for a decade or two, but is now yielding before the advance of the psychological method of approach to the problem of prophecy. A work of more permanent value is the *Altorientalischen Texte und Bilder zum Alten Testament* (1909), an exhaustive collection, edited by Gressmann, Ungnad, and Ranke, of Babylonian, Egyptian, and other literary and artistic parallels to the Old Testament. This was followed by *Mose und seine Zeit* (1913), a critical analysis and reconstruction, on the lines laid down by Gunkel, of the Biblical traditions of Moses' life and work. Gressmann also contributed to the *Göttingen Bible* the sections on the early history of Israel and the beginnings of prophecy, besides publishing a variety of *brochures* and articles in the *Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* and elsewhere on problems of Old Testament history and religion in the light of archæological discoveries in the East. These *brochures* and articles show an amazing range of scholarship, combined with a no less amazing fertility in suggestion.

In researches of this nature there is necessarily a large subjective element. There is also the danger of obscuring the distinctive genius of the Bible. It was with pleasure, therefore, that one read in the Prospectus issued by Hempel, on taking over from Gressmann the editorship of the *Z.A.T.W.*, his appeal for a more positive treatment of the religion of Israel. This appeal was, as it were, answered in advance by Eissfeldt's article in the Journal for 1926 on 'The History of the Religion of Israel and Judah, and Old Testament Theology.' In this article Eissfeldt, who is perhaps the most acute literary critic since Wellhausen, insists in the first place on the legitimacy of the historical method. Only through this method can we understand the progress of spiritual life in Israel. But knowledge of the historical movement can never lead us beyond the sphere of the 'relative and immanent.' To appreciate the 'absolute and transcendent' worth of the Bible, we must read it by the eyes of faith as a revelation of eternal truth and life. Knowledge and faith are complementary. Faith inspires knowledge; at the same time knowledge clarifies and enriches faith. For an adequate interpretation of the Bible, therefore, the two must go hand in hand. Though they may be like parallel planes, which meet only in the Infinite, yet they can be united in one person, and thus form a spiritual harmony in the finite.

The appearance of an article like this encourages one to hope that from among the younger Old Testament scholars in Germany there may arise a second Eichhorn, who shall point the way to the Highest Criticism—that of spirit and truth.

Literature.

CHRISTOLOGY AND CRITICISM.

The third volume of the late Professor B. B. Warfield's contributions to theological thought is an important work entitled *Christology and Criticism* (Milford; 15s. net). It consists of a series of extended articles contributed to the American and British learned Press during the years 1906 to 1916. The book is a masterly summary of the critical discussions of the period, including the Messianic Hope, the Sinlessness of Jesus, P. W. Schmiedel's famous 'pillar-passages,' the doctrine of the Two Natures, A. Drews' 'The Christ Myth,' the place of the historical element in Christianity, and the Virgin Birth. All these essays are marked by the keen insight, wide knowledge, and pungent style, which characterized Dr. Warfield's writings during his long tenure of office as Professor of Didactic and Polemic Theology at Princeton, New Jersey. The point of view is definitely conservative, but the book is essentially one for the modern student to read. On the one hand, he will certainly be led to take off his hat to the learning and resource of the former giants of orthodoxy, and on the other hand, he will reap the priceless advantage of seeing what modern theories look like when they are seen through the eyes of a great conservative.

The opening essay on 'The Divine Messiah in the Old Testament' shows how closely Dr. Warfield had followed continental discussions regarding Ps 45[6] ('Thy throne, O God'), Is 9[6] ('Mighty God'), and Dn 7[13f.] ('One like unto a son of man'). His claim is that 'it has again been made plain that the Messianic hope was aboriginal in Israel, and formed, indeed, in all ages the heart of Israelitish religion' (p. 38 f.). The article on 'Jesus' Alleged Confession of Sin' gives a remarkably full account of the opinions which have been held regarding the question, 'Why callest thou me good?' and a valuable long note is appended in repudiation of the contention of F. C. Conybeare that the original Markan reading was 'Call me not good.' Dr. Warfield's denial that the question implies a consciousness of sin is very forcibly argued, but this cannot be said of his explanation of the Matthæan variant. His claim is that the two Evangelists report 'different fragments of the conversation.' The seventy-five pages devoted to Schmiedel's 'pillar-passages' are trenchant to a degree, and culminate in the statement that 'if the supernatural Jesus is to be displaced from history, it is not on historical grounds that He can be displaced' (p. 255).

In the two articles on 'The "Two Natures" and Recent Christological Speculation,' Dr. Warfield attacks the attempts of J. Weiss and others to find a 'more primitive' view of the Person of Christ. He holds that there is no Christian literature in existence which does not base itself on the doctrine of the Two Natures, and that the only alternative is that of a Jesus who is either mythical or self-deceived. This issue is taken up again in a brilliant chapter on 'Christless Christianity' in which Dr. Warfield, with evident relish, describes the dismay with which the 'liberal' theologians confronted the publication of Arthur Drews' book, 'The Christ Myth,' in 1909. The article broadens out into a masterly treatment of the various attempts which have been made to depreciate the importance of the historical element in Christianity, and which so often draw their inspiration from the famous declaration of Lessing that 'accidental truths of history can never be the proof of necessary truths of reason.' Dr. Warfield traces the source of these views to a depreciation of the Person of Jesus. 'Whenever Jesus is reduced in His Person or work to the level of His "followers," His indispensableness is already in principle subverted, and the seeds of a Christless Christianity are planted' (p. 359).

The essay on 'The Essence of Christianity and the Cross of Christ' examines the critical views of Wrede, Loisy, and others of like mind. Here the argumentative thrusts are deadly. Thus, in speaking of the habit of describing Paul as 'the second founder' of Christianity, Dr. Warfield quietly remarks that one great difficulty 'arises from Paul's vigorous repudiation of the honour thrust upon him.' More merciless still is his reply to one scholar who confesses that he could not be a Christian if Christianity really were a religion of expiation. 'It is a sad confession, but by no means an unexampled one. Every Inquiry Room supplies its contingent of like instances.' But the argument is not merely a flashing of rapiers. Sound historical judgment is shown in the observation that 'Liberal Christianity' 'can live only as a kind of parasitical growth upon some sturdier stock,' while 'those who share the great experience of reconciliation with God . . . know themselves to be instinct with a life peculiar to themselves and cannot help forming a community, distinguished from all others by this common great experience' (p. 444).

The book is a powerful piece of writing. Its defect is the reverse side of its strong qualities. The skilful manner in which one critic is played off against another adds a note of piquancy, but conceals many real difficulties with which the critics deal. It is clear that Dr. Warfield had little use for criticism; he even refuses to look upon Mark as 'the primitive Gospel'; but, both as a landmark, and a defence of historical Christianity, his book is of very great value, and the intention to publish his contributions by the Oxford University Press is heartily to be welcomed.

CHRISTIAN REUNION.

Judging by the production of books on the subject, the problems of Christian Reunion are occupying many minds. Two new books are before us dealing in very different ways with the problem.

In *Christian Reunion in Ecumenical Light* (S.P.C.K.; 3s. 6d. net) the Rev. Francis J. Hall, D.D., sets out in very courteous fashion what we may call the minimum required by Catholics in any possible scheme for the ecclesiastical reunion of Christendom. It can do nothing but good to have this point of view thus honestly and frankly set forth; but the impression left on our mind is that the ideal aimed at is not likely to be realized for some considerable time. One of the most interesting sections of the book is a postscript in which Canon Streeter's views of the primitive Church are criticised.

Quite different is *The Social Sources of Denominationalism*, by Mr. H. Richard Niebuhr, Ph.D. (Holt, New York; $2.50). This is a work which deserves wide publicity and careful consideration. The author's main thesis is that it is a total mistake to regard ecclesiastical divisions as due solely to theological or ritualistic differences of opinion. For the existence of denominations many factors—political, social, economic—have to be taken into account. Denominations, in fact, are largely due to the 'secularization' of the Church; the tragic feature of whose history has been that the very body designed to afford a meeting-place for every one, in which all social and other distinctions were to be overcome, has herself become divided, and a new source of divisions among men. This theme is illustrated in striking fashion by a review of Denominationalism at various periods and in various lands. The author's hope for the future lies in the possibility of the Churches going back to their primitive aim to be societies bound together by love, and radiating a spirit of love and brotherhood.

XAVIER.

Mrs. Robertson, of Aberdeen, has written with vivid and arresting power the story of *Francis Xavier, Knight Errant of the Cross* (S.C.M.; 5s. net). She traces his career from his birth in 1506 in the lordly Spanish home among the mountains, through his eleven years of university life in Paris, and on through his early experiences of ministering for Christ by word and deed in Italy: then she graphically describes the hardships of the voyage from Lisbon to India, and his multitudinous missionary labours first in India and later in Japan. But, fascinating as all this is—and not least the incidental description of medieval university life—Mrs. Robertson stirs our interest even more deeply by her portrayal of the spiritual influences which made Francis Xavier the man he came to be. Chief among these was the powerful—if in some ways also baleful—influence of Ignatius Loyola. The interaction of these two strong souls makes a fine psychological study. Figures of great historical importance in the history of the Church and of religion, such as Calvin, Erasmus, George Buchanan, flit across these pages. At one time Francis' sympathies, it seems, lay with the Lutherans, and Mrs. Robertson raises the interesting question of what course the career of Francis might have taken, had these sympathies been permitted to develop, as they probably would have done but for the influence of Loyola. With such a devoted disciple as Francis Xavier, the Jesuit Order certainly got a good start. Incidentally, Mrs. Robertson lets us see how readily legends grow round a commanding personality, and how easily miraculous traits emerge. Xavier was, doubtless, a fine linguist, but his own confessions are enough to disprove, if disproof were needed, the miraculous power with which he has been credited of speaking in the language of whatever person he happened to address.

By her graphic and graceful narrative, Mrs. Robertson easily holds our attention from the beginning to the end, and leaves upon our mind the clear impression that she has been telling the story not only of a great and devoted missionary, but of a truly great man.

THE THIRTY-NINE ARTICLES.

The late Dr. W. H. Griffith Thomas, formerly Professor of Systematic Theology, Wycliffe College, Toronto, and sometime Principal of Wycliffe Hall, Oxford, completed some ten or fifteen years ago a great work on the Anglican Articles. It has now been published just as it was prepared for the press by the learned and scholarly author, except for a few verbal alterations and a few additions to the Bibliography. The title is *The Principles of Theology* (Longmans; 12s. 6d. net), and the subtitle, 'An Introduction to the Thirty-Nine Articles.' The work takes its place in a not over-crowded field as one marked both by careful historical scholarship and by fidelity to the Articles as containing the essential Anglican Doctrine.

In certain quarters the Articles are in disfavour. That they are too Calvinistic is a common objection. And the Prayer Book is regarded as a truer source for the principles of Anglican Theology. But Dr. Griffith Thomas holds that there is no essential difference between the Prayer Book and the Articles, both of which came almost entirely from Cranmer. The only difference between them is that between a formulary of devotion and a standard of belief; so that whereas all that is required concerning the Prayer Book is a declaration of belief that there is nothing in it contrary to Scripture, in regard to the Articles a declaration is required that they are the standard of faith and the test of orthodoxy.

As for the objection to the Articles as too Calvinistic, it is allowed that the Lutheran Confessions, more especially those of Augsburg and Würtemberg, were of more importance for the Church of England than the 'Reformed' Confessions. On the other hand, there was an essential harmony of doctrine among the Reformers amid many details that varied. Expressions on a doctrine like Predestination differ, but 'the difference is one of degree rather than of kind.' Moreover, 'there is nothing more striking than the fact that while our Articles are often verbally identical with those of Augsburg, their doctrine of the Sacraments is, and always has been, of the "Reformed," not the Lutheran type.'

Dr. Griffith Thomas would, no doubt, have had more things to say on the doctrine of the Sacraments had he written in full view of the Prayer Book Controversy, but we may take it that nothing would have shaken his opinion on Pitt's often quoted words that the Church of England has a Popish Liturgy, an Arminian clergy, and Calvinistic Articles. He regarded the falsity of the statement as only matched by its cleverness.

A brief history and analysis of the Articles leads to their exposition in detail under the successive headings of the Substance of Faith (I.–V.), the Rule of Faith (VI.–VIII.), the Life of Faith (IX.–XVIII.), and the Household of Faith (XIX.–XXXIX.). The conclusion touches on such questions as the permanent value of the Articles and the ethics of subscription to Creeds and Articles; and here as in the historical discussions of the volume the author quotes freely from Professor Curtis's 'History of Creeds and Confessions of Faith,' a work to which he also pays a handsome tribute.

It may be that our age is not interested in dogmatic theology, especially of the Confessional type here represented, with its appeal to Scriptural authority. But Dr. Griffith Thomas was no reactionary theologian, and his pages testify that he did feel the movement of modern theology; and they will be welcomed by many Anglican Churchmen who believe with the writer of the Foreword to this volume that 'the Thirty-Nine Articles still stand, not only as a great monument of the victories of the Reformation, but as an ever-steadfast bulwark of the true principles of the Church of England.'

PROFESSOR MACKINNON'S 'LUTHER.'

The fourth and final volume of Professor James Mackinnon's work, *Luther and the Reformation* (Longmans; 16s. net), is now before us. We desire to congratulate the scholarly author on the accomplishment of his task. The preceding instalments have been noted as they appeared; and all we said of them applies to this, which covers the period from the Augsburg Confession to Luther's death. Professor Mackinnon has had before him, as he explains in the preface to this volume, a strictly limited purpose. He has written not a history of the Reformation, nor a life of all its leaders, but just —Luther and the Reformation. His work is one of which Scotland may well be proud. It is not a mere compilation drawn from the vast stores of recent studies of Luther. The author has himself gone to the sources and written down his own direct impressions of the great figure whom he has, through that patient, laborious study of his writings, come to know and esteem. We receive with gratitude this massive work, the fruit of untiring research and prolonged thought. The closing chapters give a well-balanced estimate of Luther and his achievement. The former had his faults, and the latter its serious limitations; but both stand out by sheer merit and have had a permanent influence on human progress.

MYSTICISM.

Professor Rufus M. Jones renders a good service to students of Mysticism by his biographical and critical sketches of the careers of some of the mystics, ancient, mediæval, and modern, which form the chapters of his latest book, *Some Exponents of Mystical Religion* (Epworth Press; 6s. net). After an introductory discussion of the mystic's experience, he deals in succession with Plotinus, Meister Eckhart, Browning, and Walt Whitman, with a chapter on the Influence of the Mystics on Luther, and another on Mystical Life and Thought in America. Discussions of mysticism often lead the ordinary non-mystical reader nowhere, but Dr. Jones succeeds in making this aspect of religious experience as intelligible as perhaps it can be made. Plotinus he regards as 'the most worth knowing of the entire list of thinkers between Aristotle and Kant,' while Eckhart, in the fourteenth century, is 'the culmination of neoplatonized Christian mysticism.' He makes the point, also made by Miss Underhill in her book on 'The Church and the Mystics,' that the mystics were often eminently practical people: much of Eckhart's life, he points out, was spent in administration, and 'he was as strong in practical activity as in quiet contemplation.' Though Luther was neither temperamentally nor constitutionally a mystic, Dr. Jones suggests that his study of the mystics was the turning-point in his life. Browning, despite the critical quality of his mind, was yet 'in the truest and best sense of the word a mystic,' and many apt quotations from his poetry are offered to substantiate this view. Perhaps to most readers the chapter on Walt Whitman, which is also furnished with abundant and appropriate quotations, will make the freshest appeal. In one revealing page Dr. Jones lets us see his own conception of mysticism. 'Most,' he says, 'of what Herrmann'—who was no friend of mysticism—'means by the experience of communion is what I mean by mysticism.' To this intelligible sort of mysticism few readers will object. This pleasant book, with its appeal to modern poetry as well as to ancient philosophy, brings an abstruse subject within the comprehension of all students of religious experience.

A great many people in Britain as well as America will hail with pleasure a book on China which will tell them both the origin of the troubles in that distracted land, and the real situation of matters there at present. Such a book is here in *China's Revolution from the Inside*, by R. Y. Lo, Ph.D. (Abingdon Press; $2.00). Dr. Lo possesses the requisite knowledge; he is an ardent patriot, a leading Christian, and a convinced Nationalist. In a long introductory chapter he tells the complicated story of China's many internal conflicts since 1915. He is convinced that the present Nationalist régime holds the prospect of a lasting and just government. But there are endless conflicting currents, and in chapter after chapter he traces the source and influence of these. His last chapter on 'The Christian Movement' is most enlightening. He is optimistic about the prospects of the Christian Church, but he has very frank and searching words to say about the part Western powers have played in China's affairs. Decidedly this is a book to read.

'We do not think it possible to solve the problems of society unless a much greater number of people are trained to the practice of fellowship . . . the recovery of Christendom will come, not by the formation of a new party, but by the miracle of fellowship.' These two sentences are the pith of a remarkable book which is itself the fruit of much labour and thought on the part of various fellowships. It may be said to have begun in the Free Church Fellowship about 1926. The need for research and experiment brought in Copec, the Industrial Christian Fellowship, the Anglican Fellowship, and the Fellowship of Reconciliation, as well as a host of other little companies. Slowly, and through several recensions, the book, criticised and remoulded, cut down and enlarged, gradually took shape, until the present form was reached. While the sentences quoted above are the burden of it all, fellowship is expounded and commended on all its sides: its relation to the individual, to social progress, to the Church; its value for thought and faith and practice. Group life is set forth as the way to real results. Seeing that so many hands have been at work, the book is a wonderful performance, and especially manifests an amazing unity, which shows how deeply sympathetic the minds of its authors and abettors have been. It is a pleasure to say a word in praise of such sound work as this, and to urge its perusal by all who have at heart the applications of Christian truth to the problems of our distracted time. The title of the volume is *Fellowship Principles and Practice*, by a Fellowship Group, edited by Malcolm Spencer and H. S. Hewish (Allen & Unwin; 7s. 6d. net).

The Arthur Davis Memorial Lecture, which was founded in 1917, was last year delivered by Mr. C. G. Montefiore, D.D., D.Litt., who chose as his subject *IV. Ezra* (Allen & Unwin; 2s. cloth, 1s. paper). He makes this apocalyptic book, however, little more than the starting-point for a long and interesting discussion of Universalism, a belief to which many influences contributed—the conquests of Assyria and later of Alexander the Great, Stoic philosophy, Roman Law, and certain aspects of Old Testament and New Testament thought. The sinister influence of Augustine is noted, with his ominous interpretation of 'Compel them to come in,' which bore such terrible fruit in the persecutions of the Middle Ages. Dr. Montefiore has an eminently just mind, and his comments on all themes, be they Jewish or Christian, are entirely devoid of bias. His conclusions may be summarily presented thus: 'that "the *sinners* of all creeds and nations" shall at last be purified and admitted to the eternal beatitudes is,' he thinks, 'winning its way to becoming an accepted doctrine of every shade and variety of Judaism,' while 'we may say that Universalism is tending to triumph' also 'all along the Christian line.' If there are Christians who might demur to this, there are none who would not be edified by this informing and impartial sketch of the historical development of the doctrine.

Eschatological students will be interested in *The Zoroastrian Doctrine of a Future Life* (vol. xi. of the Indo-Iranian Series, Columbia University Press; $3.00 net), by Dr. Jal Dastur Cursetji Pavry, sometime Lecturer in Indo-Iranian Languages at Columbia. The volume, which is the second edition, has been enriched with some new material in the footnotes. The author, who is already known for his recently published work on Zoroastrian Sacraments and Ceremonies, gives us a presentation and discussion of the statements contained in the Gāthās, the later Avesta, the Pahlavi writings, and the Parsi-Persian literature, with reference to the experience of the righteous and the wicked after death, the manifestation of Conscience, the Individual Judgment, and the crossing of the Chinvat Bridge. He has collected and co-ordinated all the material based on the most recent Iranian research, and has developed certain additional aspects in the light of modern Parsi beliefs, with which Western scholars may not be acquainted. It would have been interesting to have the views of such a capable Parsi scholar on the resemblances that exist between the eschatological ideas in Zoroastrianism and those of older faiths, notably Judaism and Christianity. The author, however, has thought it best not to deal with this subject, though he has pointed out certain parallels to be found in Manichæism. Nevertheless, the book is interesting and valuable as containing, in the latest form, the teachings of Zarathushtra on the future life, and Bible students may themselves compare these with the Biblical ideas. There is a widely held opinion that Zoroastrian beliefs profoundly affected the most important later developments of Judaism, especially in regard to Angelology, Demonology, and the doctrine of the Resurrection. Whether this be so or not, there can be little doubt that Zoroastrianism is much nearer to Judaism than any other religion can pretend to be, and that its influence must have been antecedently felt. On this account alone, Dr. Pavry's volume should prove of much use to Biblical students.

Of the small band of scholars competent to quarry in the Talmud, the band is smaller still that can bring to the investigation of Talmudic law minds trained in the general study of law. To this small band belongs Mr. Moses Jung, LL.B., Ph.D., who devotes a volume of one hundred and forty-five pages to *The Jewish Law of Theft*, with comparative references to Roman and English Law (Dropsie College, Philadelphia; $2.00). Every aspect of this intricate subject is carefully dealt with—the guilty mind, the guilty act, what constitutes ownership, non-technical thefts, restitution, etc. Dr. Jung seems justified in believing that 'the place accorded to the Jewish law in the legal science of to-day will grow in importance, in proportion to the discovery of its historic uniqueness.' By the wide dispersion of the Jewish people, Jewish Law has been brought into contact with the laws of Babylonians, Hittites, Egyptians, Assyrians, Persians, and practically all modern civilized peoples, and in one way or another it has been affected by all these codes, and it has in its turn profoundly affected some of them. In its repudiation of the extreme form of the *lex talionis*, its refusal to expose deformed children, its repudiation of cruel punishments, and in numerous other ways, it has exhibited a rare and exemplary humanity; and Israel's juristic experiences may justly be regarded as 'a part of universal history that has a value and meaning for the world.' This claim is amply borne out by the subtle discussions of this book, which will be welcomed by the student not only of law, but of human society.

The Rev. William E. Bromilow, D.D., is a native of Australia, a member of the Wesleyan Church in that Dominion, who received the honorary D.D. degree from Aberdeen University in recognition of his notable work as a missionary pioneer in the British part of Papua or New Guinea. He has now written the story of his extraordinary experiences and their wonderful results among a savage race of head-hunters and cannibals under the title *Twenty Years among Primitive Papuans* (Epworth Press; 5s. net). It was in 1891, three years after Papua had been annexed to the British Crown, that, in response to an appeal of Sir William Macgregor the first administrator, Dr. Bromilow, his wife and daughter and several other missionaries representing the Wesleyan Church, left Sydney for their allotted post on the small island of Dobu. This was chosen for the headquarters of the mission not only because of its central position, but also because the Dobuans by their fierce blood-thirstiness 'offered a test case for missionary work.' Sir William Macgregor described the Papuans as about the worst cannibals he knew in New Guinea, which next to Australia is the largest island continent in the world. But just six years after the landing of the mission when he again visited Dobu, he was amazed to be received by sixty native students. Moreover, the Governor was struck with the fact that the natives had quite a different expression on their faces. After sixteen years of self-denying labour among this primitive people, Dr. and Mrs. Bromilow because of impaired health had to return to Australia. But on the outbreak of the Great War, when the mission was threatened with collapse, they consented to return and continue their labours for another four years. In his retirement Dr. Bromilow completed a translation of the Scriptures into Dobuan. He is able also to rejoice in his successor's magnificent work—the great Training College at Salamo on Ferguson Island where scholastic, technical, medical, agricultural, domestic and other courses are provided. Thinking of the condition that confronted him and his colleagues in face of the cannibals of 1891, and reading of the girls' school and training college of 1926, Dr. Bromilow can say with the Psalmist 'we were like them that dream.'

Some twenty years ago lovers of Browning were interested in the appearance of a new expositor of the poet in the person of a Glasgow minister. His 'Guidance from Robert Browning in Matters of Faith' was, if we are not mistaken, the fruit of popular lectures to a week-day class. They obtained a considerable popularity in published form. The minister has since become known to a large public as the editor of 'The British Weekly,' and he has now issued a companion volume under the title *Further Guidance from Robert Browning in Matters of Faith* (Hodder & Stoughton; 3s. net). The new book will probably obtain at least as wide a circulation as the old. It has all the writer's familiar charm of thought and language, with his freshness of mind and engaging familiarity. The book is suitably an exposition of 'Ferishtah's Fancies,' and will reward readers of literary and theological proclivities alike.

The author of 'The Christ of the Indian Road,' and 'Christ at the Round Table,' is safe in counting on a cordial reception for anything he chooses to say about religion. In his latest book, *The Christ of Every Road* (Hodder & Stoughton; 5s. net), as the nineteen hundredth anniversary of Pentecost is drawing nigh, he has chosen to speak about Pentecost. All the chapters of this book are written round some aspect of that epoch-making experience. The modern world is perplexed, and the modern Church, Mr. Stanley Jones believes, is 'largely unready for this year'; she knows much, but she does not know how to live abundantly. What she needs is just such an experience of the Spirit as came at Pentecost, and the book shows what the effects of such a visitation would be and how it would cut across many of the conventions and practices of our personal and ecclesiastical life. One or two references to the Lausanne Conference (pp. 40, 119) suggest that Mr. Jones is not very confident that along that route lie the things that concern our peace: it is 'a Conference largely in the hands of the old and looking to precedent rather than progress.' The book, which is profusely illustrated with apt anecdote, is aglow with devotion to Christ. The Christ for whom he pleads is 'the Christ of Every Road, especially the Christ of those Inner Roads of Personal Life and Experience.'

Widely as Professor Leonard Hodgson and Mr. Stanley Jones would differ on many points, they would probably agree in this that, 'whatever may have been the exact form of the outward events of the first Whitsun Day, there can be little doubt of its inward meaning. Those two words, insight and initiative, give the clue.' These words are taken from the chapter on 'Sacraments' in Dr. Hodgson's *Essays in Christian Philosophy* (Longmans; 9s. net). The charm of this book is its combination of the theoretical and the practical. Well aware of the close connexion between ethics and metaphysics, the writer in the earlier chapters discusses such subjects as 'The Self and "The Unconscious,"' and at very considerable length, the question of 'Freedom.' Then he embarks on problems of urgent practical importance, such as Authority, the Sacraments, the Reunion of Christendom, and he has even ventured to discuss the problem, which bulks so largely in popular and professional discussion to-day, of Birth Control.

The book is a thoughtful exposition of Christian principle in its practical application; it is inspired throughout by the faith that 'the one and only purpose of life in the flesh is the winning of goodness through the exercise of freedom.' This quest demands a helpful environment, and it is there that the sacraments of the Church come to our aid. But they do not operate magically. The sacramental life is enriched not by the study of sacramental doctrine but by the study of the character of Christ. A fine sanity and generosity characterize all the discussions. The author, who was born and bred in the traditions of the Oxford Movement, makes no attempt to conceal his ecclesiastical preferences, or his belief that the only kind of Church order reasonably likely to meet the requirements of inter-communion is the historic order of the threefold ministry; but he frankly admits that persons who differ in their views as to the mode of Christ's presence in the Eucharist may yet kneel side by side and hold communion with Him; for what matters is not how He comes, but who He is. If the discussions occasionally seem inconclusive to men of a dogmatic temper, it is because the writer wisely recognizes that discussion does not necessarily issue in 'the solution of our difficulties, but in the discovery of where the true difficulties lie.' The book makes much stiffer reading than Mr. Stanley Jones's, but there is in it the same glow of devotion to Christ, and the same ardent desire to see the mind of Christ operative in those who are called by His name.

In recent times there has been a considerable revival of interest in the great Scholastics. Those who are interested in the religious philosophy of Thomas Aquinas may be recommended to consult *The Desire of God in the Philosophy of St. Thomas Aquinas*, by Mr. James E. O'Mahony, O.S.F.C., M.A., Ph.D. (Longmans; 10s. 6d. net). It is as lucid as the very abstruse questions dealt with permit; and will convince the reader of the massive intellectual ability of the learned Saint.

Every year the Bishop of London commends a book for Lenten reading. The one this year is *Be of Good Cheer* (Longmans; 2s. 6d. net), and the author, the Reverend W. P. G. McCormick, Vicar of St. Martin-in-the-Fields. 'I am glad he has chosen the subject of "Joy,"' the Bishop says, 'as joy is the one note most wanted in our religion to-day.' The book is intended, not for the scholar, but for ordinary men and women, and it has a large prepared public in those who listen eagerly to the Rev. 'Pat' McCormick's talks on the wireless. The sermon given this month for the Third Sunday after Easter is taken from one of the chapters, and shows well the scope and sincerity of the book.

Mr. Duncan Macnaughton presents *A Scheme of Babylonian Chronology from the Flood to the Fall of Nineveh*, with notes thereon, including notes on Egyptian and Biblical Chronology (Luzac; 7s. 6d.). Obviously an enormous amount of investigation and a special study of ancient astronomy have gone to the making of this book, which traces in chronological detail the monarchs of Babylon and Egypt, and the leaders of Israel from Abraham to David. Here are a few of the more important conclusions: Naram Sin 2814–2777, Hammurabi 2406–2363, Akhenaten 1501–1489, Tutankhamen 1480–1468, Rameses II. 1417–1351, Abraham (who, it is argued, was not contemporary with Hammurabi) born 2275, the Exodus 1555, while 'the total period from the Exodus to the building of the Temple works out at 582 years,' not 480, as in 1 K 6[1]. Mr. Macnaughton, who claims to 'have no established reputation as a chronologist to uphold,' deserves credit for having gone his own way. It is interesting to learn that the Flood began on 8th January (Julian) 3189 B.C. This is accuracy indeed.

Like every good student of great literature, Professor W. G. Jordan, D.D., of Kingston, Ontario, Canada, who, by his 'Prophetic Ideas and Ideals,' 'Religion in Song,' and many other volumes, has put lovers of the Old Testament in his debt, has felt the fascination of the Book of Job, and he has given a fresh and attractive treatment of it in *The Book of Job: Its Substance and Spirit* (Macmillan; $2.00). In successive sections he discusses the need of criticism, the nature of Hebrew poetry, the unsolved problems of the book and its interpretation, its place in Hebrew literature, the book as a work of art, its spiritual significance, Job's position as a sufferer, and the passages such as the Elihu speeches and the descriptions of behemoth and leviathan, which Dr. Jordan, in common with most scholars, regards as later additions to the book. Wisely refusing to be content merely to discuss the book, he presents it, or at least its more salient passages, in Professor Tayler Lewis's translation, which he has interspersed with valuable comments that reveal the consecution of the argument. Many suggestive thoughts are scattered up and down the discussion, *e.g.* the contrast between the reverent wonder at the contemplation of the universe and its processes in chs. 38 f. and the weariness reflected in Ec 1$^{4-9}$. He also rightly calls attention to the importance of Elihu, for whether his speeches be original to the book or not, 'he no doubt represented a real current of thought and feeling in his day.' Dr. Jordan is at his best in discussing the spiritual significance of the book. In the great speech of the Almighty (38 f.) we feel, as he finely says, 'the fresh breezes, and realize that out in the wider spaces of God's world there is something that rebukes our impatience and our pride.' This study helps us to feel afresh the depth and power of that immortal book.

Mr. Frank E. Gaebelein, A.M., has written a book entitled *Exploring the Bible* (Marshall, Morgan & Scott; 5s. net) with the laudable desire of commending the Bible more particularly to youth, 'those in the upper grades of high school or the first years of college.' We very much fear that the kind of approach suggested here is much more likely to deter than to attract modern youth to the study of Biblical literature. With very slight occasional concessions to the modern position, the book stands rooted in antiquated conceptions which are disowned by practically all competent Biblical scholarship to-day, such as that Moses wrote the Pentateuch and Solomon Ecclesiastes; the Trinity is suggested in Gn 1^{26}, David wrote Ps 22, Malachi's 'Sun' (capital S !) 'of righteousness' is a Messianic allusion to Jesus—and so on. Our course through the Bible is steered by guidance on the 'seven dispensations' and the 'eight major covenants,' and 'Biblical structure is at bottom mathematical.' It is really too late in the day to treat the Bible in this mechanical fashion. The inherent vitality of the Bible is shown by the fact that it has survived so many defences and expositions of this kind.

The idea governing ***The Epic of the Old Testament***, by Mr. Arthur H. Wood, M.A., Oxon. (Milford; 6s. net), is a good one, and on the whole is well executed. Mr. Wood knows that the Old Testament 'contains some of the best stories, the best poetry, the best drama, and the profoundest thought of any work that the world has yet seen,' and he is anxious that the great host of people to whom the Old Testament is unfamiliar should also taste of this literary pleasure. He has therefore presented selections, to a small extent from the older English Versions but chiefly from the R.V., in chronological continuity, so that, as these selections are both appropriate and numerous, they practically embody the history of the Hebrew people from the patriarchs to the Maccabees. The prophets appear interspersed among the historical books, and their utterances are thus more readily intelligible. The selections are prefaced by brief but valuable introductory notes, and the leading dates are indicated.

Naturally the chapters are mentioned from which the excerpts are taken; but, if the purpose of the book is to encourage the reading of the Old Testament itself, the writer should have indicated the verses as well. This he has occasionally done, *e.g.* Jer 21$^{1-10}$, Ezk 37$^{1-14}$, but very frequently excerpts from two or three chapters are run together, *e.g.* Am 2, 5, 6, and 8, or Hos 4, 6, 8, 9, and 10, with no further indication of their place within these chapters. The combinations, too, are not always happy; it is particularly unfortunate, *e.g.*, that Is 53 and 49$^{8-13}$ should be strung together—and in this order. Poetry is usually printed as poetry; but in that case Dt 33$^{13ff.}$ should have received poetic form, and the poetic form of the Song of Deborah should have been more distinctly recognized. Mr. Wood knows that 'recent research gives the date of the fall of Nineveh' as 612 B.C. (p. 220); would it not have been well in that case to substitute this date for 607 on pp. xiv and 95? Again, the Song of Deborah, which is in the Book of *Judges*, can hardly belong to the ***Hexateuch*** (p. 217). Within two pages (97–99) Habakkuk is spelt twice correctly and twice wrongly (as Habbakuk). On p. 169 we are told that Antiochus IV. 'named himself Epiphanes, the Brilliant.' Driver, however (*Daniel*, p. xxxviii), remarks, 'This title does not mean "illustrious," but "manifest," and implies that the bearer of it claimed to be a visible god.' But these points do not detract from the excellence of the book. The work as a whole, with its wisely chosen selections, is well fitted to encourage interest in the great and greatly neglected literature of the Old Testament.

Professor George A. Barton, of the University of Pennsylvania, has given us a most valuable book, begun twelve years ago, *The Royal Inscriptions of Sumer and Akkad* (Milford; 28s. net), forming the first volume of the 'Library of Ancient Semitic Inscriptions.' The book contains a transliteration and translation of all the royal inscriptions that were written in Sumerian and Akkadian anterior to the First Dynasty of Babylon. It thus gives us the earliest historical records from ancient Babylonia, a country that contests with Egypt the earliest civilization in the world. With the exception of a few texts in ancient Elamitic, these records constitute our only source of information for the history of ancient Babylonia and contiguous countries, and are thus of the highest importance. If the volume be compared with Thureau-Dangin's 'Sumerischen und Akkadischen Königinschriften,' the large number of new texts discovered within the last twenty years will be apparent. As excavations have so far only been made at a few of the sites where monarchs reigned, the number of texts given by Professor Barton must still be only a small fraction of what may yet be recovered. Nevertheless, these give us an interesting picture, though necessarily incomplete, of the life of the country. As might be expected, they are saturated with religious ideas, and record many religious customs. Many of them deal with the building of temples and the presentation of votive offerings. In those from Urukagina we have an account of a great social and religious reform, while in the cylinder inscriptions of Gudea we are taken into the mysteries of inspired visions, the ways of the gods, and the mystic connexion between the gods and Nature. As a source of information regarding the Sumerian religion, these royal inscriptions are quite as important as the liturgies and hymns. Professor Barton provides the reader with an interesting introduction, and there are separate indexes of the Deities, Temples and Buildings, Places and Personal Names. He has done a real service to early Babylonian history in supplying us with these records, and no Old Testament student can afford to dispense with the volume.

Why Preach Christ? by the Rev. Professor G. A. Johnston Ross, D.D. (Milford; 7s. net), is designated 'a plea for the holy ministry,' and a most powerful plea it is. Lectures on preaching have been multiplied till preachers are surfeited. Everything seems to have been said that can be said, and it is of little moment who is next chosen to say it over again. But here we have something different, something far more profound. Professor Johnston Ross has set himself to make clear what preaching Christ in its fullness means and what a glorious life-task it is. This theme he has treated with a fine ripeness of scholarship and a rare maturity of wisdom. The reader feels that here is a man who has pondered long and deeply, and now that he speaks every word is worth listening to. In five great chapters full of compressed and profoundly Christian thought he shows, first, the necessity of a Divine personality to whom man's faith may attach itself; second, how Jesus functions in religion as a truly historic figure and bringer of God to men; third, what are the distinctive qualities of the Christian life, a life based on a sense of infinite obligation to God and issuing in 'a holy moral anarchy, that transcends all statute and is love pouring itself forth in zealous and happy torrent'; fourth, the indispensable place of the Church as performing certain essential functions for the Kingdom of God; and finally, the duty of aiding in the world mission of Jesus. This last chapter in particular is one of the most impressive arguments we have read in support of missionary enterprise in the light of the world situation of to-day. The writer's aim throughout has been to leave in young and generous minds the impression that in the Christian ministry can be found a task fitted to exercise a man's fullest powers and worthy of the devotion of a lifetime.

In *The Psalms, Book III.* (Milford; 1s. net), which covers Pss 73 to 89, the Rev. F. H. Wales, B.D., pursues his good work of retranslating the Psalms with the minimum of disturbance to the familiar English versions and the maximum of attention to the ultimate textual facts, so far as these can now be ascertained. That he has not gone out of his way to startle the average reader is shown by his conservative rendering of 73^{24b}, '(Thou wilt) afterwards to glory take me' (but why this relatively unmusical order of words?). Important and practically certain corrections, sometimes resting on the LXX, are unostentatiously made: for example, 84^{7b}, 'they see the God of gods in Zion'; 85^{8c}, 'to his saints, and *to them that turn their hearts to him*.' The translation combines dignity, accuracy, and approximation to our familiar versions in a remarkable degree.

For those who cannot afford that admirable classic, Sir George Adam Smith's 'Historical Geography of the Holy Land,' a more than tolerable substitute will be found in Mgr. Legendre's *The Cradle of the Bible* (Sands; 3s. 6d. net), one of the volumes in 'The Catholic Library of Religious Knowledge,' which we can well believe represents 'the final fruit of half a century's toil.' It is very clearly arranged. The first section, on Western Palestine, discusses in successive chapters the Mediterranean coast, the coastal plain, the mountains of Galilee, the plain of Esdraelon, the mountains of Samaria, the mountains of Judea, the Desert, and the Negeb. The second section, 'the Central Depression,' deals with the Jordan valley and the Dead Sea, the third with Transjordania, while the fourth discusses the geological structure of the country, its temperature, winds, flora, fauna, etc. Though the book is full of information, it is not overloaded, and it can be read with ease and pleasure, for its style is lucid and it has been admirably translated into an English idiom which at no point suggests the French original by the Dominican Sisters of Portobello Road, London. The writer makes the interesting suggestion that the particularism which characterizes the Jews may be in part due to the sentiment of isolation created by the physiographical features of Judea. There are two maps and several plans; but this book, useful and competent as it is, would have gained immensely in value had it been supplemented by sectional maps on which at least the chief places named were indicated.

Dr. Margaret Smith, who some time ago gave us a fine study of Rābi'a, that arresting figure strangely parallel in some phases of her mind to Santa Teresa, has now launched out on an adventurous voyage upon a wide sea; and her daring vessel is quite small—*An Introduction to the History of Mysticism* (S.P.C.K.; 4s. net). Twelve pages give us a clear idea—where lucidity is not easy—of her understanding of that omnibus word, 'Mysticism,' in which so many definitions sit uncomfortably wedged together, and even quarrelling a little. And then a hundred more rush as breathlessly over the earth and through the centuries, to a too sudden stop. It would require an immense mass of detailed knowledge to be fully sufficient at every point of so wide-flung a circle; and, perhaps, that is hardly present. Nor, except as a mere cataloguing of names to be hunted up and studied elsewhere, is it really helpful to be fobbed off with three and a half lines on St. Francis of Sales, and three on St. Vincent de Paul, and four on Pascal, and three on Brother Lawrence! Indeed, Dr. Smith seems to tire a little before her journey's end. At least, under the title Modern Mysticism every one since 1566 is jostled together in one short overcrowded chapter. But if the book is read strictly as what it claims to be, it is another striking proof of how widely mysticism has sown itself over the earth.

With the general spirit of *Biblical Archæology and the Hebrew Vocation*, by the Rev. J. Politeyan, B.A., F.R.G.S. (Stock; 2s. net), we are in thorough sympathy, for the writer shows that one of the incidental results of archæological investigation is to confirm the uniqueness of the Bible; but he covers so much ground in so few pages that his treatment is necessarily scrappy and disjointed, and there are slips, such as 'Ei*k*horn,' 'Ele*p*antine,' and 'B*bi*le' for 'Bible,' which do not tend to beget confidence. The most interesting part of the book is an account of Ur, the home of Abraham, and there are stray quotations from Egyptian literature.

The Bishop of St. Albans, Dr. Michael Furse, has written an attractive and helpful book of reflexions on the Christian faith, *God's Plan* (S.C.M.; 4s. net). It was done in the first place as a kind of *vade mecum* for scoutmasters to help them in the religious side of their work. In conferences the Bishop found that the three questions that scoutmasters and guiders had to face and answer were: What is God like? What is my duty to Him? and How can I do it? And these are mainly the questions discussed in this book. They lead to chapters on Prayer, on the Church, on Jesus Christ, on Public Worship, and on Service. There is a great deal of wisdom, sanely expressed and very helpful, in these pages, which may be commended to all who have the care of the young in their hands.

History is greatly indebted to specialist studies, and when these are thorough and reliable the student deserves well of the historian who uses his material. A good specimen of this kind of work is *Quakerism and Industry before 1800*, by Isabel Grubb, M.A. (Williams & Norgate; 8s. 6d. net). The book is a result of a Research Fellowship financed by the Woodbrooke Council. It is well documented, and the writer's extensive knowledge is kept well in hand so that we do really see the wood as well as the trees. The period reviewed was one in which the Christian Church largely failed to realize its corporate social responsibility.

But this charge can not be sustained to anything like the same extent in the case of the Quakers. The Quaker was not at heart an individualist, for his life in the Spirit produced a common outlook, and the characteristics of this outlook were integrity, benevolence, and a spirit of disinterested public service. This theme is worked out in detail in the volume before us, which is not only instructive but has much of the charm of good biography and good history.

The Words from the Cross.

V. 'I thirst' (John xix. 28).

By the Reverend Hubert L. Simpson, M.A., London.

'And straightway one of them ran, and took a sponge, and filled it with vinegar, and put it on a reed, and gave him to drink.' It must have been a relief even to a hardened Roman soldier to be able at last to obey the dictate of compassion. The bystanders had just heard the most awful cry that has ever broken from the lips of tortured humanity, and they could do nothing. That was the cry of the human soul in separation; this betokens the reaction of the human body in its weakness. The darkness is now passing away; the awful horror of sin has swept through the Saviour's soul; and as at the Temptation, after the crisis was over, Jesus suffered hunger, so now He suffers thirst. As once by the well of Sychar it was given to an immoral woman to quench His thirst, so now at the well of salvation a rough soldier ministers to His need.

Two draughts were offered to our Lord upon the Cross. One was the cup of wine drugged with bitter herbs of a narcotic tendency which was given in kindness to condemned malefactors to deaden pain. This soporific our Lord refused. He would not meet the Last Enemy of man with senses stupefied. It was to this high resolve to keep His senses unclouded that we owe the Seven Last Words. His true disciples were the Gifford Lecturer who refused to allow his physical sufferings to be relieved with morphia, in order that with undulled senses he might finish the proclaiming of the creed that had become his by right of conquest, whose last words were an ascription of praise and thanksgiving to Almighty God; and the caretaker of a church building, who, when they were endeavouring to administer spirits during a sudden and severe heart attack, forbade them with the exclamation, 'Na, na! I'll no' gang to my Maker wi' the smell o' drink on my lips.'

The other draught which they offered to the Sufferer on the Cross was undrugged wine, the sour beverage which soldiers drank. This He accepted, as ever holding the mean between indulgence of the body and fanatical refusal. And, by His acceptance of the offering of the nameless soldier who ran to His aid, our Lord has blessed all who have brought succour and relief to the wounded and stricken.

> All fiery pangs on battlefields,
> On fever beds where sick men toss,
> Are in that human cry He yields
> To anguish on the Cross.

One is always afraid of being guilty of a morbid pietism in dealing with those last scenes in the life of our Lord. It is a healthy instinct which has been shy of the display of crucifixes and stations of the Cross, and other would-be aids to devotion. Equally out of place is the language which tends to obscure the strong truth of the sufferings of our Lord in a mist of 'Ohs!' and 'Ahs!' There is something tremendously impressive about the simplicity, the anguish, the pathos of those words of helpless dependence, 'I thirst.' Jesus uttered only one cry of physical weakness: but He did utter one. There is something not only utterly sincere and attractive about One who is not ashamed to voice His weakness and His pain, but it gives us the key to His Saviourhood. 'In all their affliction He was afflicted—*so* He was their Saviour.' You may write books to prove that war is a 'great illusion'; and almost before the book is reviewed the most devastating war in history will have broken out. You may found a religious sect on the pleasing hypothesis that the idea of pain is a delusion, but you will not have much success in preaching or practising it beyond west-end drawing-rooms. The Cross is an ugly and painful fact, and men would gladly banish it if they could. There are many who say, 'Let us now go even unto Bethlehem.' They are enchanted with a religion which they can take up in their arms and patronize. But what do we read about them at Calvary? 'They stood afar off, beholding that sight.' It has been characteristic of the natural attitude of man all through the ages. The cross of pain and suffering, of loss and sorrow and death, is eternally in our midst. There will always be the need for the sympathetic souls who are ready to run with the sponge rather than to let their hands hang down in useless, hopeless despair or unconcern, saying, 'Let be; let us see whether any supernatural agent will help the sufferer in his hour of need.' The Saviour is the One who can use the great, simple, frank speech of humanity, 'I thirst.' A self-control that is sullen and dogged is not going to help anybody. There is a pride which tries to conceal all its wounds. Thomas was right in his conviction that he would never be quite sure that he had got a hold of his Saviour until he had fingered the wounds. The old nurse of Ulysses found the final proof of her dear master's identity when she discovered the remembered scar on his leg.

Our Lord was surrounded by those who had wronged Him, and mocked at His sufferings. He might well have resolved not to let a groan escape His lips, not on any account to show His feelings and let His enemies know how they had succeeded in hurting Him, much less to ask any act of kindness from them. 'It is sometimes more difficult to ask a favour than to grant one; it requires more of the spirit of forgiveness.' But not only did our Lord ask a favour: He expected to receive it. We often do more through our weakness than we could ever do with our strength. Fancy a rough Roman soldier *running* to succour a helpless victim! This was victory indeed. How do you get through a strong wall? You find a spot of weakness in the wall—the door, and that is how you enter in. The making of the door means to that extent the weakening of the wall, but there is no other way of obtaining access. It was at the spot in the strong walls of the Godhead, that the Father deliberately weakened, that men have found access to His heart.

'Out of the strong came forth sweetness'—but only when life had been yielded up. Look through the letters that helped you at a crisis or in some hour of great sorrow in your life. You did not keep those glib assurances that all was for the best; that time would heal; that all things work together for good to them that love God. It is never to those who are hard, or self-satisfied, or who have a comfortable and easy-going philosophy of life, or who think that there is nothing in human experience that needs explanation, that you instinctively turn in a time of need. That irritating phrase, 'It's all right,' is the watchword of the Devil. 'Hath He marks to lead me to Him?' is the question which suffering humanity will instinctively ask when darkness falls. I may not be able to see His face in the dark, but I can always feel His side. And when the world is tired of pretending that it has abolished pain and transcended weakness, and generally risen superior to circumstances, it will find its way back to where it can hear that honest, helpful confession, 'I thirst.' It will recognize the Saviour by that one cry.

In his *Recollections* a well-known man-of-letters and statesman, who was also an avowed agnostic, writes of one political crisis: 'Glad to find that I keep my head cooler than most.' The contrast between the merely superior man and the sublime man is brought out clearly in the picture which he gives of his political chief's conduct during another crisis. 'It was a Sunday afternoon. There the old fellow was, doing what old fellows have done for long ages on a Sunday afternoon, reading a big Bible.' Is there a touch of patronage, even of scorn here? The writer had the profoundest respect for his great leader. But he had yet to learn that it is to the old fellow reading the big Bible that hearts will turn, to the man who is great enough to know his weakness and the source of support, rather than to the other who complacently congratulates himself that he can keep his head cooler than most.

We are told that at the beginning of our Lord's public ministry He hungered, and that at the close He was athirst. That hunger and that thirst are His eternally until He shall have seen of the travail of His soul in a redeemed humanity. And is not this the motive of all our service, that we should have the privilege of holding the sponge to His lips; that running we may do somewhat to slake that great thirst for the souls of men?

Thou sayest this sad day 'I thirst' again,
And I, remembering how, to ease Thy pain,
Some harsh-faced Roman, stained and seared with war,
Gave Thee his vinegar
(And earned a fuller comfort than he gave),
Go forth to seek for Thee at Thy behest
Not only such suave souls as please me best,
But rough, sour souls that Thou did'st parch to save!

Religion and the Drama.[1]

By Edith Anne Robertson, Aberdeen.

I.

To-day for the first time since the emancipating yet disintegrating influences of the Renaissance, ordinary people are seeking, not, indeed, to recapture the old mediæval unity of system, but to discover a new unity of principle. It is demanded of this universal principle that it will contain a place within itself for every known phenomenon, and at the same time leave room for every possible discovery and development. The Christian mind of to-day has naturally joined in the search. For Christian thought, like all other thought, in the cases where it has freed itself from the old scholastic forms, has, ever since the Reformation, been autonomous, as politics have been, and art, and even philosophy.

But in the course of the search a most momentous thing has happened to the disciples and students of Jesus Christ:

> And all *His* men
> Look at each other with a wild surmise . . .

They count not themselves to have apprehended, but they press on. For it is they, and no others, who seem to have sighted, or to whom has been revealed, the unifying and emancipating principle for which the whole world has been seeking; and they have discovered it; it has been revealed to them, in the Person and Purpose of Jesus Christ. It is of course true that saints and mystics have achieved this principle of unity intuitionally, but it has never till to-day been applied as the supreme category of thought in the solution of the problem of the universe.

There still remains behind, however, a trail of the old type of thinking within the Christian Church, a point of view seamed and scarred both by the mediæval tradition, and by the individualistic reactions of the Renaissance. The man of this type still looks to religious authority for certain directions and instructions. He is willing, for instance, to be told what prayers to say, what feasts and fasts to observe, what theological beliefs to accept. All this he receives with the childlike simplicity with which a traveller would receive the translations of an interpreter in a foreign land. Religion has its experts, but—and here the disintegrating effects of the Renaissance are exposed—if religion is to have its experts, so must every other department of life. Is it a play? We will see what the dramatic critic says about it. Is it a political relationship? Leave that to the statesmen. Is it a philosophy of life? The universities will deal with that. Is it a question of the division of wealth? Let the economists settle that. Theoretically all this is excellent, but when it comes to the purpose of life we find that the critic has one purpose, the politician another, the philosopher another, and the economist another; and the distracted Christian, while admitting each to be an expert, cannot but suspect that the play may be bad, the political relationship wrong, the philosophy false, and that the economist has mislaid a control. In short, he has not accustomed himself to apply the supreme category of thought to every department of life and experience. When the Church is composed of members who have learned to do that the hour of her great rebirth will have come.

Meanwhile it is our duty to study the implications of this principle in one detail after another, until our lesson is learned. What, we have here to ask, is the place of the drama as a manifestation of that universal and eternal principle which is the Mind of Christ?

II.

The idea that the drama and everything to do with it is of the evil one probably first arose in the Church out of pique when she prohibited the actors from using any longer the insides of the churches for their mystery plays, and the actors in revenge composed plays which mocked the Church. But the idea would not have persisted so long as it has done without other reason. The evil nature of many plays, the bad character of many persons associated with the stage, have fostered the notion in pious but illogical minds right down to the present time, but no serious thinker to-day wishes, even if such a thing were possible, to obliterate the theatre from society.

---

[1] *Modern Religious Dramas*, ed. by Fred Eastman. (Holt & Co., New York.)
Le Maître de la Mort, par M. de la Fuÿe. (Libraire Plon. fr. 2.50.)
St. Paul. An historical play in three Acts. By Geoffrey Dearmer. (Heinemann. 2s. 6d.)
Hannele, by Gerhardt Hauptman. (The New Adelphi Library. 3s. 6d.)
Little Plays of St. Francis and *The Comments of Juniper*, by Laurence Houseman. (Sidgwick & Jackson.)
Saint Joan, by Bernard Shaw. (Constable.)
Johannis, by H. Sudermann.
The Kingdom of God, by G. M. Sierra. (Sidgwick & Jackson. 3s. 6d.)
The Servant in the House and *The Terrible Meek*, by C. R. Kennedy. (Harper.)
Outward Bound, by Sutton Vane. (Chatto & Windus.)
Good Friday, by John Masefield. (Heinemann.)
The Inheritors, by Susan Glaspel. (Ernest Benn.)

It is not that idea which we have to deal with seriously. What we have to show to be false to the Mind of Christ is that conception of the stage as something secular and apart from the religious life of the people, which goes along with the conception of the Church as something sacrosanct and apart from the secular life of the people.

Church and stage were not always so far apart as they are to-day. The first English religious play which has come down to us is known as the *Quem Quaeritis*, so called from the first words of the dialogue, and it dates from the tenth century. The play is to be acted in a church during Eastertide. A white-robed priest sits by the altar, or in front of the crypt stairs; three other priests, also in white, and representing women, come, seeking, slowly down the nave.

First Priest. 'Whom do you seek in the sepulchre, O Christian women?'

Second, Third, and Fourth Priests. 'Jesus of Nazareth, who was crucified, O heavenly one!'

First Priest.—'He is not here, He is risen even as He predicted. Go and announce that He is risen from the dead.'

The choir then sings out its *jubilate*, and the play is ended.

At a little later date came the Christmas plays, with their rather more complicated form—the birth of Jesus, the Shepherds scene, and the Three Kings scene. Sometimes these three scenes were shown in different parts of one church at the same time, sometimes the stage moved with the actors, *i.e.* the place they chose to halt in became for the time being the stage. These plays had a special educative value in an age when the hymns and prayers and words of Scripture were never heard except in the almost unknown Latin tongue. They became very dear to the common people; the rest of the service seemed more and more a dull affair, and quite incomprehensible. But you could make something of these plays, especially as the priests were beginning to throw in an English word here and there, at a crucial point. The authorities began to grow suspicious of such a happy state of affairs, and to forbid the acting of the sacred stories within the sacred walls. Outside then the actors went, but they took their properties with them and played in the market square or the tavern yard; in Cornwall they built little amphitheatres. An excellent account of all this movement is given in *The English Stage*, by Allardyce Nicoll (Benn's 6d. Library). The most extraordinary and significant fact about the drama in mediæval times, however, is that for centuries, even although it had been disowned by the Church, it managed to continue and even develop its religious character. But at last its resources were exhausted, because the knowledge, the scholarship, the inspiration, the vision which the Church might have given, she had denied. By the sixteenth century, then, we find a secularized theatre, hungrily absorbing the New Learning, developing, growing infinitely more complex and more fascinating, yet at the same time only an isolated and unrelated fragment in the brilliant, moving kaleidoscope of human society, and therefore having little real bearing upon progress or civilization. What significance it did have was due not to the theatre itself as an institution, but to the fact that here and there a great mind, and, above all, the mind of Shakespeare, had used it as its medium, and by so doing had given it a borrowed glory.

The old mediæval system was broken up, the hopeless but majestic conception of a society completely contained within the Church was for ever abandoned, and the medley fleet of human activities, arts, crafts, and professions, scattered upon the ocean of life, each self-sufficient, each pursuing its own goal, or, in words of deeper philosophic import, its own tail.

But we have not room here to consider the spectacle of the drama pursuing its own tail down the centuries, or to listen to its various justifications of its individualistic existence. No art, no science, and no philosophy liveth unto itself. As Archbishop Temple well put it the other day in a Broadcast talk, 'No sectional principle will do. Self-perfection, self-expression, "Art for art's sake," "Business is business," "My country right or wrong"—these are products of the modern departmentalism which has led us to moral bewilderment, æsthetic chaos, industrial class war, international and inter-racial jealousy with the suicide of civilisation as its inevitable outcome. The principle of unity which is to meet our need must be in its nature truly universal.'

III.

Can the Church, then, invite the actors back to her altars on the old terms? It would certainly be a hopeless invitation. For in those days the Church had high barred doors to her porches, and if she could not shut you in as a prisoner, she shut you out as an exile, and the poet and the actor both do better as exiles than as prisoners; but they do best of all when they are free sons of the house which knows no door save that one which says, 'I am the Door. If any one enters in by me he will find safety, and will go in and out and find pasture.' Through that Door, then, they are bound to return, when the wild surmise of the few has become the working faith of the many, the faith that Christ is indeed 'the visible representative of the invisible God . . . through whom the universe is a harmonious whole.'

In this wider conception of the place of the drama in religious life, that is, in a complete society, we have indeed far more to learn from the Greeks than from the mediæval Church. 'Picture an audience of 20,000 sitting for six days in an open-air theatre witnessing with intense interest the presentation of from twenty to thirty dramas—and you picture the greatest project in adult religious education which the world has yet seen. The Greeks produced that project, and it was so successful that they maintained it for nearly five hundred years. It was not a private or commercial project, but one developed by the State as a means of cultivating the spiritual and æsthetic life of citizens. The State counted this project so important that during the dramatic productions all business was abandoned, law courts closed, and prisoners released from jail. Attendance was not compulsory, but the interest of the people was so keen that more than half the entire population of Athens turned out to see the plays.

'From first to last these dramas were not regarded as entertainment, but as a distinctly educational and religious venture. As education they took the place of newspapers, books, and magazines, and the tragic poets were looked upon as the teachers of the people. As religion they served as an act of homage to the god Dionysus. They were given in the sacred places and at the sacred season of the year. The poets who wrote the plays and the actors who played them were regarded as ministers of religion, and their persons were held inviolable. The theatre itself possessed the sanctity of a temple, and the chief seats in it were reserved for the priests.

'The success of this project in adult education may be measured from the fact that it not only brought forth some of the world's greatest poets, but it developed the æsthetic and imaginative life of the people of Athens to such an extent that to this day their name is the symbol of culture. In the course of a few centuries Athens, with a population of 30,000, gave to the world more great poets and artists than America has yet produced out of a population of 115,000,000.' These words are taken from the admirable preface of Professor Eastman's book.

Something on similar lines is what we must have in the near future, and there is a widespread movement, both here and in America, towards development along these lines. The writer from whose book we have just quoted is Professor of Religious Literature and Drama in Chicago Theological Seminary. He teaches his students how to write and to produce plays, he studies the great modern, mediæval, and ancient plays with them, and in the volume before us he gives us eleven one act plays, all of which he believes will pass the following tests:

'Is the play interesting?
Will it have a religious effect upon the audience?
Do the characters have the breath of life in them?
Does the play have an adequate plot involving strong situation, conflict, suspense, choice, climax, and satisfactory solution?
Does it succeed in reaching the emotions?
Is the dialogue natural?
Does the play come within the limitations of the average church's equipment and cast?
Will it have a religious value for the actors?
Will its total effect point out or mirror the truths of life?'

Again, in his preface, Professor Eastman says: 'To-day, as in ancient Greece and mediæval England, we whose chief interest in life is religion—and especially a religion of power which challenges men's consciences, and brings aid to them in their spiritual struggles—are turning quite naturally to drama. For the essence of drama is struggle. The deepest struggles of our life are religious. The drama, more than any other art, deals with the emotional and spiritual struggles of life, and the clash of human wills. It is not a matter of chance or fad, but a course of action deep rooted in historical precedent, that in a day of revived emphasis in our religion upon the challenge to the will to right wrongs, to take up the cross of Jesus and live life dangerously, we enlist the art of drama to catch the conscience of our people.'

Nor is this writer alone in his opinions about the near future of the religious drama. 'When the new prophet comes,' says Dean Inge, 'I am disposed to think that he will choose to speak to his generation neither from the pulpit nor from the platform nor from the printed page, but from the stage. A great dramatist might help us to find our souls.'

IV.

When we come to the plays themselves, we must admit we are disappointed. It is difficult to explain why so little of our really great dramatic or poetic literature is specifically Christian, and why almost inevitably, just as soon as the definite Christian or even religious atmosphere is felt, the quality as literature seems to wane. Professor Gilbert Murray's explanation is interesting, if not altogether satisfying. His theory is that poetry has its roots so deep down in human nature, 'in time far beyond our earliest record, in psychology deep below our ordinary consciousness,' that its origins lie in regions of quietness and calm, far 'ben' behind those analytic, critical, deliberative functionings which are still at play with regard to the coming of Jesus Christ. Still, Professor Murray thinks, that greatest event in history is too near us in time to have reached those primæval inarticulate parts of experience; it is still, with us, the practical rather than the poetical imagination that is touched, Francis of Assisi rather than William Shakespeare. It is certainly a deeply interesting theory, if rather a discouraging one for the Christian artist.

Is there possibly an altogether different reason for the absence of great modern Christian plays? A great play has to be written with passion, with abandon, but ours is a self-conscious age. As one fine thinker has said: 'When we want to write religion for the stage it is self-consciously pushed into another century, or hung like a garment upon some more recognizedly saintly figure—St. Francis, for instance—some one who is revered and hallowed by common counsel, and who is also remote. We need to feel put at our ease, so to speak, by putting these tremendous words into a mouth we should not suddenly risk hearing speak quite close to us or in our own homes. We have no objection to an atmosphere, but we are not keen about personal implications. We should not care to look at *modern* religious conflict of conversion on the stage, except as secondary interest.'

Of the plays in Professor Eastman's book the finest is surely *The Valiant*, by Holworthy Hall and Robert Middlemass. The play seems to us to answer the questions which we have quoted from the preface to the collection, in a much fuller sense than do any of the rest.

All the other plays on our list are good, some of them are quite beautiful, *St. Joan* is unique in achieving greatness. But if you confronted Professor Gilbert Murray with *St. Joan* as damaging to his theory about the absence of great Christian drama to-day, he would reply that in this case Christianity has only taken over and made its own the oldest and best beloved of the heroic motives, that of the martyr. Sudermann's *John the Baptist*, little known in this country, and I do not think translated, is a noble piece of work. Masefield's religious plays are far below his best writing, but perhaps have to be seen on the stage to be fully appreciated. Laurence Houseman's *Little Plays of St. Francis*, his *Comments of Juniper*, and *Four Further Plays*, are all lovely things. Among successful acting religious plays, *The Passing of the Third Floor Back*, *Outward Bound*, *The Servant in the House*, and *The Terrible Meek*, all take a good place; Sierra's *Kingdom of God* and Susan Glaspel's *The Inheritors* make good reading as well. Geoffrey Dearmer's *St. Paul* is an attempt to depict the growing development of the apostle, but it is not very suitable for the stage. Hauptman's *Hannele* had a good run, but hardly on account of its religious content. The Book of *Amos* has been dramatized by Hetty Lee, the story of *Joseph and his Brethren* by the late Temple Gairdner of Cairo, and there are numerous other more or less propaganda plays, especially on the subjects of peace and of missions, which can be had from various societies. But propaganda is terribly dangerous, nay, it is impossible material for good drama, for it deals with details, and the very essence of drama is that it shall rise out of the immediate present, out of particulars into universals, that it shall hover in the atmosphere of transcendental being, freed from the minutiae of daily living, yet only free in order that it may seize upon that which gives reality to life—conflict, love, death, immortality. To gather up these transcendental moments out of lives grand, simple, obscure, and to weld all that the Greeks meant by *extasis*, into all that the Christian means when he says, 'It is no longer I that live, but Christ that lives in me,' to show life at its most immense, its most desperate heights and depths, and to show in those conflicts the same conflict that turned the face of Jesus toward Jerusalem to die, that surely is the adventure towards which the drama of to-morrow, and the Christian Church, will move hand in hand.

In the Study.

Virginibus Puerisque.

Parrot Disease.

By the Reverend R. W. Dickson, M.A., M.Th., Peterhead.

> 'Whatsoever things are true, . . . honest, . . . pure, . . . think on these things. Those things, which ye have both learned, and received, and heard, . . . do.'—Ph 4^{8-9}.

I wonder if you are interested just now in a new disease we are reading about in the newspapers chiefly because it has such a queer name. Really it has two names: one, the name doctors give it, and that I'm sure you wouldn't care to spell; the other, the name that everybody else uses. It is called Parrot Disease.

The doctors are worried about Parrot Disease. They say it is rather dangerous, and they are not yet quite sure of its cause or cure. You see, in our country at least, it is a new kind of ailment, and we must give the doctors time to find out a lot more about it before we can expect them to cure it.

But really, I doubt if Parrot Disease is such a very new disease. Lots of people appear to suffer from it. There is a friend of mine who has a parrot, and that bird seems such a cheery fellow, singing and whistling all day long. If you were to visit my friend, Polly would welcome you with screeches of delight. He would cock his eye at you in the friendliest possible way and say invitingly, 'Hallo, old chap, shake a paw, shake a paw!' But, my word! if you did try to shake his paw he would give you the ugliest, wickedest bite. Then he would laugh and laugh in your very face as he watched you suck your injured finger.

Some children have contracted that kind of Parrot Disease. They pretend to be ever so friendly and then, when they think you are sure of their friendliness, they take advantage of it, and they hurt. They pretend to be very chummy, but they are selfish and unkind. That kind of pretending is a very dangerous form of Parrot Disease.

But I know another parrot whose symptoms are different. (You know what symptoms are? If you get all sick and hot and covered with red spots, the doctor comes along and says, 'Ah! these are the symptoms of measles.') This bird is counted a wonderfully good fellow; in fact, some of his admirers who don't know him very well think he is rather a religious parrot. You have heard, I suppose, that some silly people teach their parrots to say extremely naughty words. Well, the lady who owns this particular bird was determined that her parrot would never learn to say anything shocking, so what do you think she did? She taught him to repeat texts from the Bible. Sammy—that is his name—will sit on his perch and look very solemn and very thoughtful, and for hours he will say nothing. That is how some parrots and people make others believe they are fearfully good and wise—they just sit on their perches and look very solemn and say nothing. Then on a day when Sammy's mistress has some ladies in to tea, and they have all been talking at once, and suddenly there is a pause while they are thinking of what to say next, just when everybody is silent Sammy will say in a low, solemn voice, 'God is love, God is love.' Of course, all the ladies look at Sammy and exclaim, 'What a charming bird! I'm sure he understands what he says, he looks so wise. Dear me! aren't parrots wonderful creatures!' And Sammy nearly bursts with pride.

But listen to Sammy after the party is over. If his mistress forgets to give him sugar he brings the whole house down with his cries. Even when he has had his sugar, and everybody is quietly in bed, Sammy will utter the most piercing shrieks all night long—just for spite.

You see, the bother with Sammy is that, with all his wise looks, he speaks without thinking. Now, it is no good being able to repeat, 'God is love,' unless you think and act on what you are saying. Lots of you are learning texts in Sunday school and at home, but do you always think what they mean and try to act on their meaning? If you don't, you've got Parrot Disease. And I must tell you that this form of the disease is worst when it attacks Sunday-school girls and boys, who repeat the beautiful truths they have been taught without thinking and acting on their meaning.

Now, let me offer you a cure, or, better still, a prescription which, if you follow it, will prevent you ever catching the infection. First, always be sincere. Don't pretend. Don't be a little sneak. Second, think on all the good things you are taught. When I say that, I mean think on them so that they will become part of you, and you will act on them.

Don't be like a silly parrot that thoughtlessly repeats good words and then makes life just wretched for everybody around. You are not really good because you can repeat your text every Sunday. You will only be a worth-while boy when you try to understand its meaning, and to put its meaning into action.

You've heard of that splendid hero, Paul, and you know he wrote a number of fine letters to his friends, and always he urged them to put into practice the great things he had taught them, and that he himself had learnt of Jesus. Paul had some friends at Philippi, and though most of them were really fine folk, some of them, I am sorry to say, contracted Parrot Disease. And this is the cure Paul gave them—'Whatever things are true, honest, pure, *think* on these things; and those things which ye have learned, and received, and heard, *do*.' THINK, and DO.

The Signed Picture.

By the Reverend Harold Bickley, B.D., Northampton.

'He made it again.'—Jer 18[4].

One autumn morning a young Scotch boy took his easel, his paints, and two or three clean pieces of paper carefully pinned on his drawing-board, down to the bank of a little stream near his village. He sat down by the stream to paint. All the morning he worked hard at his picture, and at lunch-time he lay down on the grass to rest and eat his lunch, which his mother had packed in a nice little box for him. Just then two men strolled along the river-bank, and when they came to the boy, one of them stopped and bent down to look at his painting. 'Is this your painting?' the elder man said. 'Yes, sir,' said the boy. 'Would you like me to help you with it?' 'Yes, please.' 'You have made a few mistakes; the perspective is wrong. Let me show you how to do it correctly.' So the stranger sat down on the bank, took the board and the painting on his knees, dipped a brush in the water, and began to wash out all the picture. 'Don't do that, sir,' said the boy, almost in tears. 'It has taken me all morning to do that much.' 'That's all right, my laddie; but you're not doing it correctly. Let me show you. We will begin all over again.' So when the man had washed out the boy's painting, he began to sketch the scene in beautiful colours. The boy sat beside him with wondering eyes. At last the picture was completed, the stranger gave the boy sixpence, and went on his way with his friend to the village. The boy didn't stay longer; he packed up his things and hurried home, to show his mother the beautiful landscape picture and tell her all that had happened. Of course the boy was curious to know who the stranger was, and it didn't take him long to discover that the man who had painted his picture was none other than Sir John Millais, the great English artist who did so much to revive British art in the last century. Every autumn, Sir John Millais was accustomed to stay in one or other of these Scotch villages. Most of his beautiful landscapes were painted there.

Now, that boy never forgot that such a great man had helped him, and he determined to become an artist. So he stuck to his work, and in a few years' time he won a scholarship and came to London to study, and there at the head of the school of art where he chose to study was this same famous artist who had helped him years before. He spoke to Sir John Millais, and reminded him of that autumn morning when he washed out a boy's painting and gave him his first real lesson in art; and the great man said, 'Bring the sketch along and I will sign it,' and he signed it with his own name as his own original work.

My friend who told me the story said, 'I was that boy, and my most prized and valued possession is that signed landscape by Sir John Millais.'

I like to think how that great master of art washed out all that was wrong in the boy's painting and made it again for him. I know quite a number of true stories like that in the New Testament. Jesus came across men and women who were doing wrong things with their lives. They were making wrong pictures of themselves, they were putting selfishness, greed, pride, unkindness, and many sinful things into their lives. When Jesus saw them He said, 'You are doing wrong with your life; let Me wash out all the wrong things and make your life again, and show you how to live.' He made Zaccheus again, a beautiful, kind, unselfish life. He made Paul again, and everybody who really knew him loved him. When Jesus re-made them they were far more beautiful than they were before, and He signed them with His own new name, so that when people saw one of them they said, 'He is a Christian; he has been made again by Jesus.'

Jesus comes to you girls and boys who are not making the best of your lives. He says, 'Let Me show you how to live, how to be kind and good and loving; let Me help you to live like Me.' If we say Yes, and mean it, then we shall be pictures of Jesus signed with His name, and our lives will be the most beautiful things any one can see.

The Christian Year.

EASTER SUNDAY.

Immortality.

'Now if Christ be preached that he rose from the dead, how say some among you that there is no resurrection of the dead?'—1 Co 15[12].

The number of those who boldly assert their denial of any future life is few, but occasionally one finds men more bold than their fellows who are prepared to assert definitely that all hope of a future life is illusory. In Mr. Wyndham Lewis's book, *The Art of being Ruled*, this attitude is adopted. 'Christ's doctrine,' he says, 'was a drug. Beneath its influence men saw their wrongs being righted, saw "the oppressor's wrong, the proud man's contumely," punished and humble faith rewarded, the last first and the first last. Is it,' he continues, speaking of the teaching of Jesus, 'the action of an honourable man to give people these flattering visions?' For one man thus outspoken, there are twenty whose minds are filled with questionings. There were men in the early Church who felt like this. Perhaps they did not boldly assert that dead men do not rise, but they doubted the Apostle's teaching, and in 1 Co 15 Paul strives to demonstrate the certainty of the faith in the individual's resurrection to eternal life.

1. Paul had one advantage over the modern preacher. Few of those whom he addressed doubted the truth of the Resurrection of Jesus, for it was impossible for them to do so. They need only go to former unbelievers like James the brother of the Lord to find him tell the story of the appearance of the Lord which turned his hostility into loyalty; or to cautious disciples like Thomas, who except he had seen would not have believed; or they could find at hand many of the five hundred brethren of whom Paul writes, 'the greater part remain unto this present, but some are fallen asleep.' The early Church was living on the impulse communicated to it by the appearance of the Risen Lord. The preachers proclaimed no conquered leader, lying in a Syrian tomb, but a living Lord who had kept His appointed tryst with His favoured followers and who had made His power manifest in their midst. The Jewish world is keenly interested in a book published by the foremost orthodox Jewish scholar of our time. Although other writers, such as the historian, S. Setzer, and Dr. Chaim Zhitlowsky, caused much comment by their books urging the Jewish people to reconsider their attitude to Jesus, Dr. Klausner's book, *Jesus of Nazareth*, in which the author represents Jesus as the embodiment of ethical and religious idealism, has caused a sensation. There is much which causes sorrow to a Christian in this brilliant book, but the treatment of the Resurrection is significant. While he believes that Joseph of Arimathea, after having laid the body of Jesus in his new tomb, secretly removed it at the close of the Sabbath, and placed it in an unknown grave, he denies that there was any deception on the part of the early Church. 'The nineteen hundred years' faith of millions is not founded on deception. There can be no question but that some of the ardent Galileans saw their Lord and Messiah in a vision.' As Christians we are convinced that there was reality behind the visions. 'If Christ be preached that He rose from the dead, how say some among you that there is no resurrection of the dead?' We do not doubt that Jesus overcame death, why do we doubt that others than He may share the victory over the last enemy of all?

When from the dead He rais'd His Son
  And called Him to the sky,
He gave our souls a lively hope
  That they should never die.

2. In addition to this argument which we may call the argument from history, Paul used another argument which may be regarded as the argument of the emotions. As the years pass, heaven becomes a more powerful conception in the thought of all good people. The vacant chairs on earth remind us of appointed places in the Father's home.

I never stand beside a bier and see
  The seal of death set on some well-loved face,
But that I say one more to welcome me
  When I have crossed the intervening space
Between this land and that land over there,
One more to make the strange Beyond seem fair.

We are so conscious of failure in our own lives that we would not charge God with harshness if He did not consider our lives worth conserving, but allowed them to be extinguished as a match by the night winds; but we have known lives of such saintliness that we are sure that God has other work for them to do. The Church at Corinth had its roll of saints, with regard to whom the thought of extinction was impossible. Unbelieving husbands, heedless sons, could remember wives, mothers, sisters, brothers who had witnessed a good confession, and many turned to Christianity because they believed it held out to them a hope of being reunited with the beloved one who had gone. Confining ourselves to one of the many possible meanings of Paul's words, we find this idea behind the question, 'What shall they do who are baptized for the dead, if the dead rise not at all?' Many careless Corinthians who had refused to listen to the pleadings of devoted Christian relatives when they had been with them, found themselves longing for the handclasp of a departed friend and for 'the sound of a voice that was still,' and the promise of re-union which the Christian faith offered had proved the determining influence in winning them for allegiance to Christ and for witnessing to that faith in baptism.

3. The third argument is that based on the lives of the men who formed the early Church. If they had desired, they might have been as others, interested only in worldly aims. 'Let us eat and drink, for to-morrow we die.' Instead, it was apparent that they were living their lives on a higher level, striving to realize noble ideals which time did not create and which time could not destroy.

So much of the weakness of our religious life to-day arises from the fact that we do not truly believe and put to the test these great words, and many others like them. Divested of the garments of our frail mortality, the soul goes on to a life more wonderful by far. To the Christian, death is an episode in life, an adventure at one stage of the long journey which brings us to God. The great gift of God is not immortality, but something better, a possession infinitely greater, eternal life, which is already possible in this world through such a union with God in Christ that the death of the body cannot interfere with it in any way whatever.

Jesus uttered words which make us know that the departed are living a life more glorious than any we know, following the great Captain of our salvation in another state of being more glorious than any we can imagine. 'Whosoever liveth and believeth in me shall never die.' Our sorrow must therefore be accompanied by its note of triumph. It is not for us to allow our imagination to carry us beyond the simple yet unfathomable words of the Master.[1]

First Sunday after Easter.

In this Life most Miserable.

'If in this life only we have hope in Christ, we are of all men most miserable.'—1 Co 15[19].

1. Do these words mean that if the Christian hope of life everlasting is never to be realized, then the Christian life is one of uncompensated delusion, an irrecoverable waste of a singular opportunity? With such an interpretation of St. Paul's words many thoughtful people cannot agree. On the contrary they hold, whatever may be the future after death, that the Christian life is the finest in quality, the widest in scope, the most animating in spirit the world has hitherto been able to conceive; and that should there be no life when this life is over, the man who has lived the Christian life and cherished the Christian hope, which is inseparable from the Christian life, has made the best of the only existence he is ever to know.

2. Whatever St. Paul meant we must not be intimidated by texts. We must understand them. If we would understand this text we must put ourselves in the time and place of him who wrote it. Indeed, we must do so in all our Bible reading if we would escape the misapplications and misinterpretations of Scripture which have made some men unbelievers and others fanatics.

Now, if we try to put ourselves back into St. Paul's day and position, imperfectly as we may be able to do so, we see that the life of the Christian propagandist was one of exhausting labour, anxiety, and suffering. But the cause of the suffering was not directly Christianity itself; it was the hostile action of Jewish and pagan society upon Christianity. To communicate what Paul considered the Divine revelation of a Father in heaven and life with Him for ever, he had to become an outcast from his family and descend from his high social position, to renounce his place in the government of his people and his prospects of distinction; he had to run counter to his intellectual tastes, to adapt himself to the society of classes beneath him, whose manners and speech and idea of life were all against the grain. He had to endure suspicion and stiffness and secret hostility from the party he had joined and to whom he brought so much, as well as incessant attacks upon his orthodoxy and the validity of his orders. In addition, he was subjected, with painful frequency, to violent bodily persecution.

Now, if suddenly, when Paul was near the end of life, worn out with labour and suffering, and murmuring to himself, as his tired eyes looked up to heaven, 'Henceforth there is laid up for me a crown of righteousness,' if *then* a fatal, infallible voice had struck upon his soul: 'There is no living Christ, no life to come, no God, no heaven in the wide grey, lampless world,' proclaiming that all his labours and sufferings had been endured for a great delusion, then we can understand the thought—

---

[1] A. Chisholm, *High Roads and Cross Roads*, 80.

sharp as a knife stabbing into the heart, blinding the soul in a black hopeless night—bursting out into a passionate cry of irresistible unmeditated protest, 'If in this life only we have hope in Christ, then are we of all men most miserable.' But amid all his miseries Paul was not miserable. On the contrary he described himself as 'sorrowful yet always rejoicing, as having nothing and yet possessing all things.' Those who realize the Christian life, and believe in the ever-continued development of the soul in a life continued after death, attain the highest possibilities of which this human nature is capable.

3. Nevertheless, there is widespread a sort of belief or feeling that a Christian life, when thoroughly carried out, is a joyless one of self-suppression, and not one of complete self-development, and is only to be undertaken for the sake of unspeakable bliss hereafter. In harmony with such a misconception are the words once spoken by Dr. Newman: 'This world is a very little thing to give up for the next. Yet if we give it up in heart and conversation we shall gain the next.' On the contrary, it is a crime to give up this world. For this world is as truly the world of God as is the unseen world.

Whatever may be the nature of the next life, it cannot be the same as this. For this life is a combination made up of body and spirit. But we know that death disintegrates the body, for 'flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God, neither doth corruption inherit incorruption.' To lose what this world and its Divine combination may do for us, is to condemn ourselves to be so much the poorer for evermore. This has been well said by Browning when he declared that the true end of this life is the expansion of the human soul into a love passing out of itself with some other soul to mingle:

Else it loses what it lived for,
  And eternally must lose it;
Better ends may be in prospect,
  Deeper blisses (if you choose it),
But this life's end and this love-bliss
  Have been lost here.

4. What is the central idea of Christianity? It aims, as its central idea, at the reconciliation of man with God. Now, as the whole order of the universe is a product of the creative mind of God, reconciliation with God must mean harmony with the indwelling, energizing mind of the universe, of which man (body and mind) is the highest manifestation known to us. Reconciliation with God means man's body and mind realizing their potential perfection; the mind of God inherent in them. It will be admitted, even by moralists who do not appeal to a Divine sanction, that, on the whole and in the long run, happiness arises from virtue. Would a man who had lived a life of temperance say on his deathbed, if then he became convinced that there was no life for him when he was dead: 'If I had my time to live over again I would not be restrained from the gratifications of drink, but would take the jovialities and intoxication of a drunkard'? When we see the shattered, degraded, burnt-up beings who have succumbed to this degrading vice, who of us would think he had wasted a chance because he had not experienced this? Are sullenness and malignancy, the meanness of the liar, the feline caution of dealers in dishonesty, the apprehensions of the underhanded, the greed which pinches a home, the crossness which darkens it, the cruelty which terrorizes it, and the unfaithfulness which shatters it—are these the dispositions and experiences a man would choose to possess, if he were sure there was no life after this? Whether it be true that things are right because they produce happiness, or that happiness is the preordained result of right conduct, whatever be our moral theory—Eudæmonism or a Divine moral order—happiness and virtue are by the nature of things allied.

But the aim of Christianity is to make all men virtuous, to reconcile them to God's moral order; and therefore if virtue tends to happiness, and Christianity tends to virtue, then does Christianity tend to happiness. It condemns extravagance, intemperance, ungoverned and consuming passions, the secret and sly paths of dishonesty, the dishonour and infamy of a life of vice. It bids us honour the body and cultivate the mind, and elevate the spiritual nature and be temperate in all things. It tends to lengthen the days, to prolong happiness, to keep off disease, to assuage mental distress, to give peace and courage to the conscience, to make a man a fine and noble creature in mind, body, and estate. All the virtues which good men cultivate and hold in honour, even when they do not believe in God, are enforced by Christianity. Beauty and truth and love; all that science can tell, and art can show, and honourable ambition attain, and manly and womanly pleasure enjoy, 'all things are yours and ye are Christ's, and Christ is God's.'

5. But through it all, says the Agnostic, is the delusion of another life after this. But how do you know it is a delusion? If ours is a delusion it is

not an ignoble delusion. It is the delusion which expects a to-morrow. But is it ignoble for the scientist to hope to complete to-morrow his investigation, or for the artist to hope to-morrow to realize his ideal of beauty? All our to-morrows have an element of uncertainty about them, for death stops the investigation, and the picture, the poem, and the music are unfinished; and there are no wedding bells. Yet do we look for to-morrow, and to-morrow is heaven—for heaven is our idea of perfection, and to live a life with the ideal and hope of perfection is the highest life which can be lived. If it can never be attained, it is a supreme distinction to have had it. Now at least we may confidently say that under all possibilities the Christian life is the finest that can be attained; and interpreting the exclamation of St. Paul for ourselves, we may reverse it and say, 'If in this life only we have hope in Christ, still are we of all men most blessed.'[1]

Second Sunday after Easter.

Faith, an Activity of the Soul.

'The work of faith.'—1 Th 1^3.

1. Of the three phrases which the Apostle uses in this verse—'The work of faith, the labour of love, the patience of hope'—the one which is most difficult to understand with exactness is certainly the first, 'the work of faith.'

'The labour of love'—that comes home to us all at once. We know that love at its purest has within itself the quality of pain. Love is, indeed, an election to suffering. A pure love lays us open to a thousand assaults of suspense and fear.

The other phrase—'the patience of hope'—if somewhat more obscure, also comes home to us at once as something which we ourselves know to be true. We only need to consider for a moment to see that patience is the very heart of hope. To be living by a great hope is for any one of us to be living in the midst of fears. To be living in this world on some private hope is like carrying some precious vessel across a crowded street. Anything may happen. A strong hope introduces us at once to a new world of misgivings and possible disasters. Like love, like any spiritual call, like any word of God, hope brings not peace, but a sword.

In the same way—so the Apostle must mean—work is the very soul of faith, the very atmosphere in which faith lives. We know that where love is, there is that inner condition of longing and suspense and prayer—a true travail of the soul. We know, too, that where hope is, there will always be need of patience, the soul steadying itself under the shock of many a disappointment. In the same way—so the Apostle assumes—faith put its own kind of strain upon the soul; faith too involves us in a kind of life of its own. He who would have his lamp of faith burn brightly must see to it that he lives in an atmosphere of work. He must see to it that he purge his soul of all indolence and heaviness; that he gird up the loins of his mind; that he respond to all his surroundings, acting and reacting, maintaining a certain alertness and watchfulness, accepting and rejecting, according to a kind of spiritual taste or standard within himself. In short, faith also puts the soul upon a certain strain; and as the strain of love has for its note, labour, and as the strain of hope has for its note, patience, so the strain of faith has for its note, *work*.

2. Now, at the very outset, this is not the opinion about faith which we find amongst outsiders. In their view, faith is a form of human weakness or insincerity. Now the point of this text is that here St. Paul says something about *faith* which is the very opposite of all that. He says it is not the easy and convenient thing—to believe; but the hard and inconvenient thing.

Yes: the easy thing certainly is, not to believe. Faith is surely harder than sight, and bears witness to a finer and more delicate perception. It is easier to build a fence than to write a poem. It is easier to be engaged in the business of the world—its eating and drinking and its pleasures—than to feel the power and summons of that other world of which the best souls are aware. It is easier to see nothing than to see God. Fifty men, a thousand men, can walk over the fields in the evening, for one who, as he walks, can feel what Wordsworth felt when he wrote the lines on Tintern Abbey. And which of them was right? The fifty men who saw nothing, or Wordsworth who saw God; the fifty men who felt nothing, or Wordsworth who 'felt the Presence which disturbs us with the joy of elevated thoughts, the sense sublime of something far more deeply interfused, whose dwelling is the light of setting suns, and the round ocean, and the living air, and the blue sky, and in the mind of man'?

It is surely easier to see than to believe. Well, that is the idea underlying the words 'the work of faith.' And the idea is that faith lives within an atmosphere of work, of spiritual liveliness, and daring.

---

[1] W. Page-Roberts, *True Religion*, 35.

3. The author of the Epistle to the Hebrews defines faith as 'the substance of things hoped for, the evidence of things not seen.' That is to say, he who has faith has within himself as his own personal secret the proof and the pledge of things not seen. It is by his faith that he perceives the unseen world and takes hold on God. It is therefore the work of faith to keep clear and free from all obstacles and hindrances and distorting mediums the passage between one's soul and God.

Now one thing which that involves is that a man must deal strictly with himself. He must take charge of his own personal integrity and honour. For let us never forget that one can believe only what he is meanwhile living for. Anything else is not faith. It is at best superstition; it is an attempt to outwit God by a manœuvre. We believe in the unseen only as we live for the unseen. We believe in the soul and in God only as we reverence the soul—the Divine capacity in ourselves and in others. Let any one live frankly for this world, and what is the penalty? Many things doubtless, but this for certain: that person loses all happy sense of God.

It is laid upon each one of us, and it ought to be a happy responsibility—it is our work of faith—to take up the obscure tasks within ourselves which we know must be attended to if we are to live on happy terms with Jesus Christ our Lord. We must see to it that the Holy Spirit has His way with us. We must work along with the Holy Spirit, we must work *out*, work out in real actions within ourselves and in the world also, what the Holy Ghost is working into us. If we refuse this work of faith, if we disregard and put aside these private instructions of the Holy Spirit—why, then, we are like children who have disobeyed a mother whom all the time they love—we are unhappy even in our disobedience, and we shall never be happy again until, like children too, we fling ourselves in sorrow and confession upon that loving One whom indeed we love, although for one miserable hour we disobeyed Him.[1]

THIRD SUNDAY AFTER EASTER.

Things which destroy Joy.

'Your joy no man taketh from you.'—Jn 16²².

It has sometimes been said that we do not emphasize the dreadfulness of sin to-day, that we slur it over.

But was Jesus continually inveighing against sin and denouncing those glaring sins which went on in His time as much as in ours? Was He continually dwelling on those grosser sins which prurient people love to hear denounced from the pulpit? No; the things He chiefly denounced were just the very things which religious people don't like hearing denounced because they are the things to which they probably are most prone. The things He really did use hard words about were the sins of the religious people of His time—hardness of heart, uncharitableness, inhumanity, self-righteousness, pride, and hypocrisy. His method was rather to show the beauty of goodness and the marvellous love of God for men in such a manner that people would see for themselves the dreadfulness of their lives, the hopelessness of living away or apart from God. Except in the case of the Pharisees His message to the people was almost entirely positive rather than negative. He put before them good, and the joy of goodness; He talked to them of happiness and how happiness could be obtained by positive virtues; He showed them love and all that it means; and those who heard with their hearts saw the pettiness and misery of their futile lives and became new people. Sin is a dreadful thing, for it is that by which we put a cloud between ourselves and God; the light of God's love cannot get through; and so surely the best way to get rid of that cloud is to tell of the love that is ready to break through, rather than to harp continually on the cloud that hides it.

1. The things which destroy joy in our hearts are those which put this cloud between us and Him; we no longer feel the sun's warmth and healing power and the joy goes out of life.

The root of all sin is selfishness. Selfishness is the antithesis of that self-giving which is Love. We do not emphasize enough our Lord's teaching about the heart. 'Out of the heart of men proceed evil thoughts, murders, adulteries, fornications, thefts, false witness, blasphemies,' these are the things which defile a man; we see a man's actions and we judge his actions, but it is that which is in his heart, *i.e.* his thoughts, which matters most; if a man's heart is full of self there is no room for God, as Trench says:

> God often would enrich, but finds not where to place
> His treasure, nor in hand nor heart a vacant space.

Now each of us can know our own thoughts, and what is more we can to a very large extent control them. It is not necessarily sin to have evil, selfish, licentious, or impure thoughts, because they may come spontaneously; but it is to dwell on them, because we can try to think of other things. St. Paul is teaching this truth when he says: 'Whatsoever things are true, whatsoever things are honest, whatsoever things are just, whatsoever things are pure, whatsoever things are lovely, whatsoever things are of good report, if there be any virtue, if there be any praise, think on these things.' The greatest saints I know are those whose minds are filled with beautiful thoughts, and especially thoughts of how they can help others and kindly thoughts about others. One feels instinctively that God is close to them because the love in their hearts has thrown out selfishness; in fact, they seem to have no time to think of themselves. And the things which destroy joy are just those things which make us think about ourselves. The answer of Moody to the man who asked him if he were saved, 'I am so busy trying to help others that I have no time to think of myself,' might well be taken to heart by a great many people who worry about themselves.

---

[1] J. A. Hutton, *The Fear of Things*, 35.

2. The things which destroy joy in our lives are just the very things which we religious people have to guard against—self-righteousness, pride, hypocrisy, self-satisfaction, envy, hatred, and malice; and it is time that we Church people should realize not only how soul-destroying these things are to the spiritual life, but also how much harm they are doing to the cause of Christ and His Church. If the joy of the first Christians was one of the chief reasons why people were attracted to Christ, and joined His goodly fellowship, and the lack of it in Christians to-day is keeping people out, we have to study the reasons why we have got away from the early Christian attitude; and few will deny that the chief reason is to be found in just those things which our Lord denounced in the Pharisees — self-satisfaction, pride, pompousness, snobbery, small-mindedness, censoriousness, and lack of sympathy and real love in dealing with others; and these are unfortunately only too noticeable both in the clergy and the laity.

We know well enough that snobbery is to be found in every class of society to-day. But the one place where it should not be found is in the Church and among Christian people, for the man who is a snob loses all sense of that joy which is able to abound and be abased as well. A certain padre in the war, a very able man, went to the officer commanding his unit one day, and asked him why it was he did not seem to be getting on with the men in that unit, to which the officer replied: 'You have asked me a plain question, and I will give you a plain answer. It is because you are such a snob.' All the padre could answer was, 'I believe I am.'

Closely allied to snobbishness is our ungentlemanliness. There can be no better definition of the word gentleman than a man like Jesus Christ, for there was nothing in His character of weakness or sentimentality, but there was everything of strength and courage and courteousness in His dealings with others. Unfortunately the term has come to be used of, and applied to one section of society, so that the accident of birth is the only passport into this category; and, in consequence, men and women ape this section in dress and speech. It has come to matter a great deal more whether a man does not wear brown boots with a tail coat than whether he is courteous and kindly to others, and especially those dependent on him. The unchristian—which means the ungentlemanly—behaviour of people in all grades of society, is responsible more than anything else for our social troubles. Through our ungentlemanliness we lose a great deal of the joy of life, the joy of seeing others happy and contented, and the joy of knowing that we are playing the game by them even if they do not respond.

3. It is time that some of us who profess and call ourselves Christians did some healthy changing of our minds about some of these things. We have allowed ourselves to adopt the standard of the society in which we live, and have got away from Christ's standard. There is no Christian joy in the heart of the man who is always worrying about whether he has got the position he deserves, or thinking of his rights. Our Lord's saying: 'It shall not be so with you,' needs emphasis to-day. It is frightening when we read of societies being formed to secure the rights of the clergy, or to hear that young men won't become parsons because of insecurity of tenure or the encroachment of the laity on their rights: it all sounds so sub-Christian.

Are we altogether right in our ideas about the magnification of the office of a clergyman? The ordinary Church layman wants his vicar to be a 'big' man in town or village, to take a certain place in its society, and to remember the dignity of his office. Above all, he must be dignified, which generally means that he must be just a little remote; and one sees men gradually losing just that human touch and approachableness, and becoming afraid of giving away themselves or their position. There is a standard type to which we must conform, and once we conform to type we lose our naturalness, and with it the joy of being ourselves. We think of the office and not the work, and aim at a false dignity. We have a tremendously responsible and honourable position as priests and ambassadors for God, but the position will not help us to be of use to God and to do His work unless we hold it as servants of Christ and of our fellow-men, as ministers and instruments for God to use. He can use our personality, our humanity, because we have placed ourselves in His hands. Once we 'put on side,' or fail to be human, we lose our influence for good, because nothing could be more unlike Christ than that ; the spontaneous joy of being led by the spirit of Christ has gone.[1]

Fourth Sunday after Easter.

Capitalized Grace.

'The unfeigned faith that is in thee, which dwelt first in thy grandmother Lois, and thy mother Eunice ; and I am persuaded that in thee also.'—2 Ti 1^5.

Is this reference to Timothy's grandmother and mother to be taken as anything more than a pleasant remembrance of two good women ? Is it seriously meant that what they were counted in Timothy's religion ? It is hardly to be doubted that this is the suggestion, and thereupon arise more questions. Have family connexions and a family heritage any bearing upon particular and personal religion ? Has the precarious science of eugenics, which is the application of biological science to sociology, any kind of foothold in morals and religion ?

1. The idea, at first, wears an attractive look. It looks like a principle of conservation. It looks as if it would solve at least some of the bitterest enigmas. The Kingdom of God might be secured on the simple lines of succession. The law of the Spirit might resolve itself into a law of natural inheritance.

But a suspicion infects the mind. We begin to wonder whether goodness and godliness which came by a way so easy would be worth the name of goodness and godliness. Spiritual achievement would be only a reminiscence. More disconcerting still, such a law of spiritual heritage would of necessity work both ways, if it worked at all. Multitudes would be damned from their birth, and with a finality more real than any social reformer has had to reckon with. So the speculation grows grim and forbidding. Responsibility disappears out of wickedness ; value goes out of goodness ; worth departs out of character ; initiative vanishes from life.

There is more than a disintegrating suspicion about these fancies. The facts of life break the notion to pieces. There is the plain fact of the bad who come of good stock. 'The sons of Eli were sons of Belial.' Happily this is not all that is to be said. If the moral succession cannot be reckoned upon, the immoral succession breaks down also. One of the most sinister life-stories of the Old Testament is lit up by a surprise of this kind. It is the bad story of Jeroboam, of whom the prophet said, 'Thou hast done evil above all that were before thee.' But a light shone in the dark house of Jeroboam, for there was a son of that evil line who was different. He could not save the situation, and, in truth, all that came to him was an honourable grave. But this was not a small thing in a dishonoured line. 'He only of Jeroboam shall come to the grave ; because in him there is found some good thing toward the Lord, the God of Israel, in the house of Jeroboam.'

2. What is this talk of good stock or bad ? Who is there that is altogether either of one or the other ? Be it asked with all reverence, was the genealogy of our Lord Himself without spot or blemish or any such thing ? The genealogy stands within the Gospel, and there are significant omissions. 'Joram begat Ozias' ; but Joram was not the father of Ozias. Between the two came no less than three ignoble life-stories. It was a recognized principle among the Jews that nefarious names might be dropped out of view in genealogies, but there are names frankly written in the list which lie in shadow. 'There were links of iron and brass in the line, as well as of silver and gold.' The Incarnation has its human roots in the mixed Adam stock.

Timothy's lineage is not exhausted by two good women. Of his father we know nothing, but the surmise is that he was Greek. If then there is talk of heritage, in the blood of Timothy a Greek and a Hebrew strain were mingled, and greater contrast and more probable antagonism could hardly be found.

Thus we are at the problem of heredity, and it is here that biology takes up the discussion. For long we grew accustomed to a determined scientific dogmatism, and we listened so meekly, and found the teaching so insistent and confident that heredity and its problems became an obsession for more than one generation. But the biologist has shed much of the dogmatism, and is not nearly so sure as once. This is the conclusion of one of the foremost biologists of our day : 'What has the biologist to say ? Little more than this, that well-fated, or ill-fated, each living creature is born a new creature—an individuality. There is variation as well as continuity, and the mould is, so to speak, broken each time. Each creature is a new creature. And in the case of man this seems to imply a personality with a will of its own to this extent, that it may or may not use possibilities of nurture in a manner quite unpredictable. The radius of freedom of choice may be long or short, but there is some freedom, *something unpredictable in the activity of each new child.*'

---

[1] W. P. G. McCormick, *Be of Good Cheer*, 60.

3. There is the religious and Christian view to be stated, and it is no nerveless confronting of a fate, and no helpless bafflement by an enigma. To the Christian, heredity is no iron fate gripping and clamping the individual life in the vice of the past. If inherited evil has power, so has inherited good, and God is greater than any human inheritance, and keeps a power of surprise in His hands for use.

Lois and Eunice are not irrelevancies in the story of Timothy. What they were had much to do with what he was, or they would not have been named with this honour. 'To make a sound Christian of a Hindu,' said a missionary, 'you have got to convert his grandmother.' If it is our lot to be of good stock, let us give thanks for it every day we live. It is a great thing to be in the line of a spiritual aristocracy. Let us take it and acknowledge it as the prevenient love of God which made ready for our good, planting in us a quick spiritual sensitiveness.

The late William W. Peyton, in an arresting book, *Memorabilia of Jesus*, has a final chapter with the daring title 'The Christ in our Blood.' He expounds our Lord's boundless faith in the unspoiled elements of our human nature. 'It is the standing danger of all civilizations,' he says, 'and it has been the grave of civilizations, that we forget the early moorland of our birth in the paved streets, stocked shops, bonded warehouses, halls of science, and the artificial lawns of our villas.' There are elements answering to Christ entwined in the primitives of us. And of the human sources of it, he has this to say: 'If you are an earnest man, your Christianity is a transmitted instinct. You have two thousand years of it in your blood.'

There is not a good life lived before us in our stock which has not made the battle of life easier for us.

4. Yet beyond human heritage, and if need be in the teeth of it, there is an immediate and mightier Power available and at work, and every new thing that comes with every new life is open to the grace of its dealings. 'Something unpredictable in every new life,' says our biologist. That unpredictable is rooted in God. The law of human heritage is transformed and transfigured in the region of redemptive grace into a Divine heredity. At the close of the table of names in St. Luke's Gospel there is an astonishing utterance. Coming at the end of a dull list of births and deaths, it is a declaration staggering in its magnitude. If it is not true, it is a blasphemy, for it is a libel against God. If it is true, it is enough to shame us utterly in the thought of stain upon our kinship, and, at the same time, to bring a catch in the breath as at a sudden glimpse of potentialities beyond our measuring. 'Enos, which was the son of Adam; Adam, which was the son of God.'

There are many things to say in answer to that sinister side of heredity we have been thinking about. That the power of it is limited is a fact verified by experiment and in experience. There is the denial that Nature is mightier than nurture, which was made on the authority of Dr. Barnardo, out of his unique experience in dealing with thousands of young lives. There is the fact that whatever heredity is, it does not put an end to moral freedom and thus to moral responsibility. It may fix our trial but it does not fix our fate.

And there is a greater thing to remember. God, who gave to man his being, made him partake of His own nature. It is only in the fact that man is the child of God that sin gets meaning. It is for us to accept our sonship, to live in the consciousness of it, and in its strength and dignity. We need power for this, and it is what Christ brings—the power to be what we truly are; the power to fulfil our possibilities and reach our destiny.

This was the power Jesus gave and gives to those who believe in Him—a great lifting love, a mighty affection, a carrying enthusiasm—power to become sons of God. If so be that there comes to us, by the far or near human stock to which we belong, an invasion and pressure of God's grace in our very blood—that good thing which was committed unto us, guard through the Holy Ghost which dwelleth in us. But if so be that no such reinforcement be ours, let none despair because of it, nor reckon the pull of lower things to be a fate. 'The Eternal has lodging in us; it is ours to turn it into a home.'[1]

---

[1] T. Yates, *The Strategies of Grace*, 158.

'Actors': Christ's Word of Scorn.

By the Reverend Donald Matheson, M.A., Peaslake, Surrey.

When Jesus called the Pharisees 'hypocrites' He was using a figure of speech which is not suggested to our minds by our English use of the word. This fact partly accounts for our loss, both of the point of Christ's accusation and of the full meaning of the anger which the sin aroused in Him. For His meaning we have substituted the notion of *pretending to be religious*, which is scarcely present in His use of the word. I think we have failed in consequence to guard ourselves as we might from a far commoner vice, which is rarely treated from the pulpit.

It is true that an actor is one who pretends to be what he is not; and that sense is used by Mark in 12^{15}, and also in different ways by both Matthew and Luke in telling the same story, which apparently they took from Mark.

But an actor is also one whose doings in a play have no moral or religious significance in his case, whether he plays virtue or vice. And this latter meaning will fit all the sixteen other occurrences of the word in the Gospels. In thirteen of these, *all placed on Christ's lips*, this meaning seems the only one that makes sense.

In three of the sixteen (Mt 24^{51}, Lk $12^{1.\ 56}$) it is difficult to say which of the two meanings is uppermost. But in the great passages where hypocrisy is the main subject (Mt 6^{1-18} 15^{1-10}=Mk 7^{1-23}), and Mt 23, as in Lk 6^{41-45} and 13^{10-17}, there seems no reasonable doubt.

In Mt 6 religious duties performed not for love, or even fear, of God, but to win praise from men are called by Jesus 'hypocrisy,' and are said to have 'no reward,' *i.e.* no moral or religious value. This preference for man's praise as against God's implied, of course, a corresponding effort on the part of other men to impose rules of conduct on their neighbours. Both actor and critic took for granted that it was within man's province to judge others. Both helped to maintain a system which tended to eliminate the thought of God from morals. And Jesus included both partners in the same description. Why else does He label as 'actor' (Mt 7^{1-5}=Lk $6^{42f.}$) him who judges his brother, and offers to cast out the 'splinter' from his brother's eye when 'a whole rafter' is in his own?

These passages are typical of all the rest. In Mk 7^{6} (=Mt 15^{7}) hypocrisy is defined by Jesus as 'teaching for doctrines commandments of men,' *i.e.* teaching man-made rules of conduct as if they were Torah. People who can remember English evangelical society in the 'sixties and 'seventies of last century can probably recall a number of 'eleventh commandments' about dress, and amusements, and devotions, and Biblical interpretation. Some of these, of course, were excellent in themselves, as was the rule to wash on returning from market. It was the motive that was wrong, the bowing to man's approval till God's approval was left out of account.

How many a man has experienced the reality of God and has begun a new life, but on finding that society about him demands much the same virtues of honesty, kindness, modesty, reverence, church-going, has slipped gradually into the easier obedience, and, to borrow a phrase from the Fourth Gospel (which never names hypocrisy), has 'loved the praise of men more than the praise (δόξαν) of God.'

In the 23rd chapter we find how this hypocrisy shut out the view of God's loving will for men, substituting rules that could either be obeyed or come to terms with on a more or less commercial basis. And this either rendered true religion distasteful ('shut the kingdom'), or made the converts worse casuists than their teachers (vv.$^{13-22}$). The tax paid on garden plants, as if they were field-crops, became more important than the greatest commandment (vv.$^{23-26}$). The ambition for the approval of men who see the outside made people careless of the judgment of God, who reads the heart (vv.$^{27.\ 28}$); and outward compliance with some of the martyred prophets' words made the hypocrites pay respect to the martyrs' memory while inwardly they were of the mind of the persecutors.

The root of their hypocrisy was that love was left out of their conception of God, and they had no welcome for Christ's message of it, as He indicates in His closing words (vv.$^{37.\ 38}$), 'How often would I . . . and ye would not!'

With regard to the anger of Jesus, may we not say with reverence that the most characteristic trait of His character was His continuous and intense realization of God. God was everything to Him, from His reply as a boy to His mother down to His last words from the Cross. And here was an ethic urged indeed in the interests of the national religion, yet tending both to ignore the Heavenly Father and to destroy that unity of morals with religion which was fundamental alike to His own message and to true Judaism.

What seems to me a confirmation of this view of Christ's teaching on hypocrisy is found in the Apostle Paul's use of his Master's word. He was missionary pastor at Antioch, a meeting-place of many nationalities and of many vices. He was at least as anxious as any modern missionary for his converts' moral purity. But he deliberately discarded the traditional rules in which he had been brought up, and which had been invented to dissociate pure Jews from vicious heathen. Instead, he trusted to the Spirit of Jesus 'given to all them that obey him.' He and his fellow-apostle, Peter, dined in Gentile houses and shared in the common meal of Christians—Jew and Gentile together. But when old-fashioned Jewish Christians came from Jerusalem, Peter was afraid of what they would think of him. He 'withdrew himself' from such association, even, I suppose, from the *agape*. Paul told him he was an 'actor'; he was playing to a human audience, not obeying God's will known to him through his moral judgment enlightened by the Spirit of Jesus. Peter carried his bad example so far that other Jews, and even Paul's friend Barnabas, 'joined in his play-acting' (συνυπεκρίθησαν). Our versions (A.V. and R.V.) have 'dissembled,' and Lightfoot—to whom men of my generation owe a great debt—has a long note labouring to show that there was religious pretence in Peter's action. But surely that labour is wasted if by 'acting' both Paul and his Master before him meant not 'pretending,' but 'turning duties to God into duties to men.'[1]

In that case the passage in Galatians is doubly interesting, both as showing how the technical sense Jesus attached to the word was continued as a criticism of legalism, and also as being one of the few verbal links between the Founder of Christianity and its extender to the Gentile world.

---

[1] Dr. Streeter (*Four Gospels*, chap. xviii.) seems to think Paul was wrong and Peter right in their difference at Antioch. But that hardly affects the meaning of the word 'dissembled.'

Contributions and Comments.

Matthew xxvi. 50:

'Friend, wherefore art thou come?'

Several years ago an article upon this text from the pen of Professor Deissmann appeared in this journal. It is now incorporated in the latest English edition of his well-known work, *Light from the Ancient East*. Readers may recall that he was then exulting in the discovery of a Syrian goblet which was inscribed with words that offered an illustration of the text. The inscription encircled the goblet and ran thus: εὐφραίνου· ἐφ᾽ ὃ πάρει, or, as it might also be read, ἐφ᾽ ὃ πάρει· εὐφραίνου. Professor Deissmann prefers to read the words in the latter order and holds that ἐφ᾽ ὃ πάρει is interrogative, 'Why are you here? Rejoice.' The question and the exhortation are doubtless appropriate to the festive use of the cup. But ἐφ᾽ ὃ is not naturally taken as the equivalent of ἐπὶ τί, and we need not assume a solecism either in the inscription or in the text of Mt 26^{50}. The inscription may quite well be read εὐφραίνου· ἐφ᾽ ὃ πάρει, 'Rejoice: the thing you are here for,' the ordinary relative sense being retained. And as for the text in Matthew, an excellent meaning is expressed, if the words ἐφ᾽ ὃ πάρει are taken as exclamatory, 'Companion, the thing you are here for!' It is an ejaculation called forth by the unique crisis of the moment, and involves an appeal that must have pierced the heart of Judas. The poignancy of the appeal is sharpened, if we accept the suggestion of Dr. Rendel Harris that a cup so inscribed may have been used at the Last Supper. For the exclamatory use of the simple relative, cf. Menander, *Epitrepontes*, line 146 (Loeb Classical Library), ὦ Ἡράκλεις, ἃ πέπονθα! 'Heracles, how I am treated!' And for a partial parallel to the utterance of Jesus, cf. the exclamatory style of Socrates in Plato, *Euthyphro*, 15 E, οἷα ποιεῖς, ὦ ἑταῖρε! Our Lord is, of course, intensely serious, whereas Socrates is ironical.

The Revisers of the English Bible adopted another line of interpretation with the support of Euthymius Zigabenus and the Armagh MS. It apparently found favour in the learned circles of the Greek Church. For that reason, as well as for its own merits, it deserves to be carefully weighed. But the meaning afforded, 'Do that for which thou art come,' is less suitable to the context.

James P. Wilson.

Ayr.

The Cosmic Christ.

'Unto him be glory in the church by Christ Jesus throughout all ages, world without end.'—Eph 3[21].

It is beginning to dawn upon us what were the immensities to which St. Paul linked Christ. With advanced science and education, instead of becoming less, they become greater and more staggering in their ramifications and implications. In this chapter he writes about 'the unsearchable riches of Christ,' 'the beginning of the world,' 'principalities and powers in heavenly places,' 'eternal purpose,' and then, as language fails him, he writes about comprehending the breadth, length, depth, and height of the love of God which passes knowledge. Then comes our text as a corner-stone to the temple of infinities, eternities, and immensities.

If Jesus is of present value to me in every circumstance, and if I am to believe others when they say that Jesus is of personal help to them every day, whether they live in any one of the continents outside the one on which I live, and if I am to believe further that Jesus has been a help to millions of men and women for nineteen centuries, then there is no alternative but to accept the standpoint of St. Paul, that Jesus has always been connected with this world in relation to its men and movements. If Jesus can re-create man, there is nothing to prevent linking Him to the creation of man. If Jesus can affect man nowadays, there is no reason why He should not be at the grand consummation the effective person. Once Jesus is admitted to be a person of universal power in a single human or time relation, no logic can keep Him out of all others.

In the benediction which is our text, St. Paul asserts that the glorifying of God is the purpose of Christ. The instrument of the glory is the Church. That fact is staggering, because the Church is an organism that transcends all denominations, sects, and nations. It is bigger than every other organization, higher than, and above all, our barriers. The person to bring about the glory is Jesus Christ. He is the only one in time, or out of it, who is big enough to accomplish such a task. He can attract all colours and classes. In Him there is no colour question and no class caste. Because He reduces all men to sinners, and then transforms them into saints, He has a secret that none else can take away.

It is the extent of the glorifying of God that takes away our breath. In time it is 'throughout all ages.' There is no moment in the past, present, or future that Jesus does not touch. There is no second to which He is not linked. The glory of God never ceases to reveal itself at any time, because Jesus is in possession of a dominion in which His presence never sets. The British Empire boasts of never having a setting sun, the Dominion of Christ boasts of never having a setting presence. Jesus was back at the creation of the world. Indeed, through Jesus the world was created, and without Him it could never have been created. He is the inspiration of every progress, the inspirer of every advance, the consummation of every purpose, and the end of every movement. Nothing can happen without the Christ or apart from His presence and spirit. When we grasp these immensities, we shall realize with St. Paul that temporary defeats do not matter, for the ultimate triumph is a certainty, and it belongs to Jesus.

But St. Paul suggests something greater than this even. He not only tells us that God's glory is throughout all the ages, but that it is also 'world without end.' Not only time, but place, space, the universe, and the cosmos are subject to Jesus Christ. Jesus not only touches every moment in time, He also touches every particle in creation. 'The whole universe groans and travails,' and the whole universe is to be redeemed. Matter as well as men are in the scheme of re-creation. We have related Jesus to this earth as if this earth were the only thing that concerned the power and love of Christ. Science tells us, however, that this earth is a mere drop in the ocean of planets and suns. There is universe after universe, one following the other in staggering infinities. On the sands, we can only look at the distances and we are lost. Our instruments have failed to measure this universe; they only help us to guess. At best we can only say a little about five hundred stars. No wonder, for the nearest to the earth is ten thousand times as distant as the planet Neptune. Some of the five hundred suns that we know something about are a hundred times as distant as that even. Their light takes four centuries to travel to us. We know there are about six thousand stars which are visible to the naked eye, and there are myriads in addition in the Milky Way. It is assumed that light would take 300,000 years to travel from some of these to earth. Our earth is not far from the centre of our own universe. But what of the other universes that are beyond? In our universe there are 2,000,000,000 luminous suns, which are single and double, giants and dwarfs.

If Jesus is anything, He is what St. Paul claimed Him to be. He is related to the cosmos. He is linked up with every sun and star. He is the creator and sustainer of every planet. He is the God of every being, be He higher than man or lower.

E. Ebrard Rees.

Merthyr Tydfil.

W. Robertson Smith.

Might I venture to correct a slight error, in Mr. Mathieson's excellent survey of Robertson Smith, in regard to Smith's *Prophets*? The date of the second edition of that work, with introduction and additional notes by Cheyne, was not 1902, but seven years earlier. This 1895 edition was further reprinted in 1897.

If it be said that the Lectures themselves, in 1895, were practically a reprint from 1882, the reply may be made that Cheyne in his own introduction to the book speaks of 'the present work' as now appearing 'in a second edition.' That introduction is dated August 1895.

It is interesting to note that in the bibliography which he prepared for the third edition of *The Religion of the Semites*, Dr. S. A. Cook dates the second edition of the *Prophets* in 1902, as he also does in his important article 'Jews' in the *Encyclopædia Britannica*, 11th ed., vol. 15, p. 373, col. i. On the other hand, in the full and excellent bibliographies attached to chapters xvii.–xx. of the *Cambridge Ancient History*, vol. iii. (prepared, I presume, by Dr. Cook), the date of the second edition of the *Prophets* is given as 1895.

William Scott.

Dundonald, Kilmarnock.

Mr. Scott is correct in giving 1895 as the date of the first issue of the second edition, with Cheyne's introduction and notes, of *The Prophets of Israel.* Besides the reprinting in 1897, there was one in 1902, followed by a reissue in 1907, to which last the copy I use belongs. In setting down 1902 as the date of the second edition, I was following the long and detailed bibliography appended to Robertson Smith's *Life* by Black and Chrystal. That bibliography does not mention the second edition of the *Prophets* under 1895, but gives the reprinting under 1902. I was puzzled as to the reason for this, because I was well aware that Cheyne's augmented edition had been issued in the year after Robertson Smith's death. However, I decided to quote the date thus given in the official bibliography as probably intended to represent the definitive issue. The proper connexion of the second edition with the year 1895 is mentioned in the *Life* in a footnote at p. 459, which is worth quoting: 'The edition of *The Prophets of Israel*, with Introduction and Additional Notes by Professor Cheyne, published in 1895, may safely be taken as indicating the direction in which Professor Smith's mind had been moving during the interval between the first publication of these lectures and his lamented death.'

W. M. Mathieson.

Broughty Ferry.

Philemon and Slavery.

May I supplement Dr. Tuting's letter (September 1929) with a word or two? Quoting from the Fragmenta of Philemon, he sent me to the Fragmenta of Euripides, where I knew I could find many things of like purport on slavery. Oddly enough I had just been protesting against a testimonial to a distinguished editor which ended with the words 'defence of the poor and oppressed.' My feeling was that defence of *all alike* was finer, and Euripides' assertion, repeated again and again, is that freemen and slaves are *alike* in their faults and their virtues. The lost *Melanippe* had some fine things in it; but perhaps the best lines for quotation are from the *Ion* (845–6):

> ἓν γὰρ τι τοῖς δούλοισιν αἰσχύνην φέρει
> τοὔνομα· τὰ δ' ἄλλα πάντα τῶν ἐλευθέρων
> οὐδεὶς κακίων δοῦλος, ὅστις ἐσθλὸς ᾖ.

This corresponds very closely with the Fragment of Philemon, which Dr. Tuting has kindly sent me:

> κἂν δοῦλος ᾖ τις, σάρκα τὴν ἀϋτὴν ἔχει·
> φύσει γὰρ οὐδεὶς δοῦλος ἐγενήθη ποτέ,
> ἡ δ' αὖ τύχη τὸ σῶμα κατεδουλώσατο.

Bernard G. Hall.

Knutsford.

Printed by Morrison & Gibb Limited, Tanfield Works,
and Published by T. & T. Clark, 38 George Street,
Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to The Editor, Kings
Gate, Aberdeen, Scotland.

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

PROFESSOR JAMES MOFFATT, whose departure to 'the other side' has been one of our greatest losses in recent times, has hit upon an ingenious, interesting, and not unedifying idea for his latest book, *The Day before Yesterday* (Williams & Norgate; 5s. net). By the day before yesterday he means the period from the eighteen sixties onwards, for about thirty-five years, and his aim is to consider certain aspects of the strain between faith and philosophy or science during that generation, noting how some lost their faith in God altogether, how others devised substitutes for Christianity, and how others again looked for light to fall from the clouds, if not on themselves, at least on the next generation. It is not so much the theology or philosophy of that period he discusses as the literature, and how that literature reflects the currents of thought of its day.

The advantages of such a review are not small. We are always apt to look on the past with a feeling of superiority, and this confident—and superficial—temper often fails to realize the importance of being able to distinguish between things that happen and things that matter, largely because we have not disciplined ourselves to verify a principle of judgment by studying the history of the day before yesterday. We dismiss the events of these years as of little more than antiquarian interest, and yet sometimes forces started in that period are telling with unconscious power upon the life of the present. Also we are apt to forget that, though the battles of the day before yesterday were not waged with the same weapons as ours, the leaders of that day were meeting foes who face ourselves in different guise, and we learn that the Christian religion has been under fire before now, that it has given way to panic as well as to over-confidence, that it has handicapped itself by adhering to outworn tactics and weapons, and that it has displayed recuperative powers which have been a surprise to its followers, as well as to its opponents.

Just recall what the day before yesterday was like. It witnessed the appearance of Darwin's 'Origin of Species,' the great economic and industrial development of Britain, the Civil War in America, the aggrandisement of Prussia, and the publication of Herbert Spencer's 'First Principles.' It was the age of Renan and Taine, of Mommsen and Ranke, of Tolstoi and Dostoievsky, of T. H. Green and Martineau, of Dickens and Thackeray, of Bagehot and Lang. It was a time of upheaval no less in thought than in politics, and particularly in religious belief. The new ideas of creation and the struggle for life, of continuity and progress, of historical proof and literary research into the origins of humanity and tradition, were stirring the pool with fresh impacts, whose ripples are still being felt. Dr. MOFFATT, with his almost unrivalled equipment of literary culture and theological knowledge, disentangles for us the significant facts amid this welter of currents and movements.

These significant points he calls respectively 'A Third Religion,' 'The Loss of God,' 'Nature for God,' and 'Instinctive Faith.' By a third religion he means briefly that the Christianity of the day before yesterday was felt widely to be so poor a thing that many efforts were made to replace it by something better. The Christianity that Mazzini saw in Italy, that Butler encountered in the Anglican Communion, that Amiel met in Switzerland, was not a 'great work of God.' It failed to appeal to the intelligence, the imagination, or the conscience. It lacked vitality and nerve, it was conventional and timid. It had in particular three faults which alienated many minds. It shut its eyes to the newer conceptions of creation and causation; it ignored the religious significance of Nature and the order and beauty of Nature; and it tabooed many of the simple joys of life by its false puritanism.

The result was seen in the 'mongrel religions' invented to take the place of Christianity, such as those in Tancred and 'Robert Elsmere.' It was seen also in the strenuous efforts of Ibsen to find something better than the Christianity with which he was familiar, which seemed to him an evasive, conventional hypocrisy. Ibsen thought that paganism, which was (for him) the empire of matter, had been succeeded by Christianity, the empire of the spirit, and that the third, and final, empire was to be one in which spirit leavened matter, and matter spirit. This somewhat vague conception came to him from the joint influence of science and philosophy, and his significance for us lies largely in the fact that a poor kind of Christianity invariably creates reactions of one kind or another in minds for which religion is a necessity, but for which also there can be no terms made with a religion that is merely the art of hedging and dodging realities.

In his chapter on 'The Loss of God,' Dr. MOFFATT describes the influence of Darwin's researches. There was, of course, the spread everywhere and to every sphere of life and thought, of the idea of 'evolution.' It dazzled and dismayed Christians, since it appeared to explain away creation, reduced the Bible to the level of a natural phenomenon, evaporated anything like revelation and left no place for freewill. These are familiar features of the period. But the indirect result of the scientific movement was even more remarkable, as seen in a writer like Hardy, for example. Hardy's view of life was just the struggle for existence on its lower side vivified by imagination. This underside preoccupied him with its ugliness and fatuity. The world in Hardy is rather a horrible place. Men's passions, virtues, visions, crimes, obey resistlessly a Thing that 'heaves through space.' His real and fatal weakness was that the good was always second in his scale of values. What determines a man is what he puts first, and where there is no supreme value attached to goodness or God there can be no religion.

Dr. MOFFATT deals at length with Meredith and his cult of Nature, which he idealized as a kindly mother, and with Matthew Arnold and his passionate vindication of a religion of some kind, a religion freed from the trammels of tradition and loyal to what he considered the secret of Jesus. These pages on the two great literary figures are full of fascination and instruction. But enough has been written to show the trend of Dr. MOFFATT's analysis. Instead of pursuing this, it may be useful to extract two of the general summaries in which the book abounds. In one of these Dr. MOFFATT contrasts the chief interests to be found in the literature of the day before yesterday and in our literature to-day. To-day, in verse and prose, these are the erotic and the economic. Novels and plays preach as much as before, but it is not religion that is their text. It is love and hunger. Whereas the religious interest is more prominent in the books of the day before yesterday, there are to-day far more novelists than between 1860 and 1890, 'who resemble lively and dirty cockroaches in the basement of the House of Life.'

On the other hand, it is noted that philosophy has become less agnostic and materialistic than it was fifty years ago, and this revival of idealism has told in favour of an attitude to the universe that is more patient of a religious interpretation. This has been more responsible than anything else for the bankruptcy of the older naturalism. Christianity is still exposed to gusts of error, but religion is less embarrassed to-day by movements of real philosophy. Dr. Moffatt insists that his review of the day before yesterday shows that religious people were more right than either they or their opponents knew in maintaining the spiritual intuition against materialism.

The real issue in the day before yesterday was this: Is the highest to be interpreted in terms of the lowest? Do the claims of science involve that the human soul or mind is no more than a pattern woven on the stuff of matter, no more than an illusion of the grey matter in the brain? These issues absorbed the thoughtful over half a century ago. We have only to look around us to see how the situation has altered. The materialistic scheme has been repudiated and discredited. Determinism has been largely abandoned. Reality has been seen to be too great to be grasped by our physical categories. Religion itself has been largely renovated by a frank admission of the claims of Nature. The efforts to invent new religions, the arrogant claims of science, the insistence on outworn religious traditions, all these have passed in large measure away. And if there is still a fight to be fought, at least it is to-day easier for earnest minds to say, 'I believe in God the Father Almighty, Maker of Heaven and Earth.' And this we owe, partly at least, to the struggles of the day before yesterday.

Each generation has its own problems for the preacher, and to-day he is faced by the apparent indifference of the many. Whatever he may have to say, there is no great multitude, if we may judge by the empty seats in churches, who are anxious to hear it. To a perplexed world he has words of eternal life to offer, but there are few who are willing to lend an attentive ear. Why is this? Is it that the people are really indifferent to a message which they need so sorely, or is it that the preacher is perplexed no less than the people, or is it that he cannot transmit his message to them because he cannot speak their language?

There is perhaps an element of truth in all three contentions. Dr. J. Fort Newton, in an interesting book on *The New Preaching* (S.C.M.; 5s. net) tells of a gifted and high-minded young man who bluntly asserts that 'no preacher over forty can speak our language, and the young fellows shy at the pulpit.' If this is true, it is sad indeed, for it would mean that there is a great and impassable gulf between the preacher and the men whose allegiance to the gospel he is most anxious to win, for on the moral and religious quality of the youth of to-day will depend the spiritual tone, and to that extent the essential welfare, of the world of to-morrow. Happily, it is very far from being universally true; for there is many a preacher far over forty who has the heart of a boy, and who can speak the language of the young as well as they can themselves.

Nevertheless the experience of the War did reveal to many a chaplain that the conventional language of religion was hopelessly unintelligible to many of the soldiers to whom it was addressed. Words like 'grace,' 'faith,' 'salvation,' meant no more to them than their Greek equivalents would have done; and one can sympathize with the Australian who insisted that it would be a good thing to drop the word 'salvation' for a few years from the vocabulary of religion, so unreal had become the ideas associated with it. And this consideration leads Dr. Newton to one of the features which must characterize the new preaching; it must learn to translate the truths of faith into the idiom of to-day. This effort of translation will be a valuable discipline, alike intellectual and spiritual, for the preacher himself, for it will compel him once more to confront Reality, and not only to re-express but to re-think the meaning of terms whose pristine vividness and power readily become dulled by conventional and professional handling.

For the preacher himself is implicated in the spiritual temper and outlook of the age. Even though he rises above it—as he must, if he is to be effective—he also stands within it, and that is at once his opportunity and his peril, a peril to which it is fatally easy to succumb. 'No wonder,' says Dr. Newton, 'the people are bewildered and turn away from the Church; the pulpit itself is perplexed and confused, unable to find its way.' 'A multitude of people are hungry of heart, confused, astray, adrift, and the Church does not meet their need.' There is a widespread feeling that 'modern preaching is chaotic, anæmic, and lacking in power.' 'The failure of the pulpit to reform the wicked, to hold the attention of the young, to win the respect of the lover of science, to attract the man in the street, is clearly manifest.' These are grave words, but they are spoken not in cynicism, but in love; and the book is written to point the way to a clearer understanding of the new congregation which the preacher of our generation has to address, and to the new strategy by which it may be won.

But it will not be easy to win. For one thing, the new congregation knows next to nothing about the Bible, so that expository preaching of the type practised so successfully by Parker, Maclaren, Dale, George Adam Smith, Denney, Dods, is 'well-nigh impossible, at least in America, where life moves to the rhythm of motors, movies, and jazz.' In Great Britain the situation is perhaps not yet quite so desperate; but it would be affectation to deny that even here the Bible is nothing like so familiar as it was two or three generations ago.

This ignorance of, and indifference to, the Bible is symptomatic of a widely diffused temper, which it is the preacher's business to challenge, but to challenge which successfully is one of the hardest things in the world. 'A spirit,' says Dr. Newton, 'has been released among us, wild, restless, ruthless, realistic, rebellious, disillusioned, sad, making mock of chastity, reverence, restraint, and even truth itself.' 'Even our boys and girls are cynics, *blasé* and bored,' and 'no one can deny that our age is strangely astray in its own life, baffled and confused.' Another writer, B. I. Bell, in a book entitled 'Beyond Agnosticism' noticed elsewhere in this number, similarly remarks that contemporary thought concerns itself with all the things which count for least and ignores most of the things which matter most—'it is always talking of origins and rarely speaks of destinies.'

All this is true, but, happily, it is not the whole truth. In every congregation there are faithful souls 'who keep the faith amid all change and chaos, without whom the heart of the preacher would turn to dust.' And not only is there a faithful nucleus in every congregation, but the age itself is not so deeply immersed in material interests as a superficial diagnosis might suppose. Dr. Newton is too good an observer of the times not to know that in our generation there is 'an eager wistful longing for a more vivid experience of spirituality.' The preacher is never really alone. He finds his support not only in the few who demonstrably care for the Church and the gospel, but in the very restlessness of the age, which is nothing but a pathetic and unconscious reflection of the yearning for something more deeply satisfying than anything it now possesses or knows. The preacher has more allies than in his depressed moods he is aware of.

Our own age, though distinctive enough, has much in common with every other age. Even in the so-called Ages of Faith, there were, as there are to-day, forces of evil which had to be combated, and the preacher is wantonly diminishing his vitality and crippling his influence who allows himself to cherish the conviction that his generation is more insensitive and impervious to a spiritual appeal than the ages which preceded his own. But if he is to drive home his appeal effectively, he must, besides fully understanding the gospel he proclaims, and being able to express it in the idiom of to-day, have the wit to recognize, according to Dr. Newton, that 'the future will be ruled by the Spirit of Science and by the Democratic Principle.' Even if, in the light of recent and existing dictatorships, the latter principle may seem to some not quite so secure as it once was, there can be no doubt about the former. The Spirit of Science has assuredly come to stay. Its conclusions may, and some of them will, be challenged; but its method and its temper are abiding things, and the preacher must make up his mind to reckon with them; and if that method and temper are entirely alien to him, he is little likely to help men who are convinced that science too has her own wonderful revelation of God.

But it is the supreme function of the preacher to testify to his experience of Reality, as Reality has been revealed in Jesus. And his testimony must be a real testimony, he must be expressing not his opinions but his convictions. He must be able to say not only 'I believe,' but 'I am persuaded'; and Dr. Newton inclines to the opinion that his utterance will be all the more persuasive if it take the form not of a read sermon but of vivid, glowing, extempore speech. It will be news to many people that 'in 1720 the Church of Scotland, in its Assembly, declared the reading of sermons to be displeasing to the people of God and an obstruction to the gospel.' That this statement is too drastic is proved by the moving eloquence of Thomas Chalmers, John Hunter, and many another, whose read sermons have stirred the souls of their hearers to the depths. But, broadly speaking, the spontaneous utterance of the well-prepared mind is not only more attractive, but more effective, and every preacher should covet earnestly this most excellent gift.

Dr. Newton has proved his power as a preacher on both sides of the Atlantic. Every page of his book stamps him as a keen and experienced observer and a master of his craft, and by its skilful diagnosis of the contemporary situation and its sympathetic appreciation of the preacher's task, it is well fitted to fascinate preachers and laymen alike.

Whatever Professor W. R. Matthews writes is sure of wide and appreciative attention, for he is one of the half-dozen theologians of our time who are original thinkers. And when he chooses so timely and urgent a subject as 'The Destiny of the Soul,' he at once captures our expectant curiosity. The subject is urgent in itself for all believers, and it is timely because, owing to the researches of science and psychology, it has become one of the most debated topics of our day. The article with the title mentioned is printed in *The Hibbert Journal*, and our readers will be glad to read a summary of its conclusions.

The older conception of the 'soul' was that it is a something unsubstantial inhabiting the body and quite separable from its corporeal dwelling-place. But psychology has poured scorn on that idea, and no one now holds it in its former simplicity. Dr. Matthews refuses to enter into a discussion of the nature of the soul. He prefers to state the question thus: Has the personal experience which we now enjoy a future? Is it capable of persisting after death? And, if so, in what conditions may it be supposed to exist? These questions are debated with eager interest, and the fact that there has been such a lack of conclusiveness is due to the different presuppositions from which the disputants start. They assume different conceptions of the nature of reality.

On the presupposition of materialism or naturalism there is very little evidence or reasoning that can be considered as of real value. That is obvious. It might be urged, however, that, when we are dealing with empirical evidence, philosophical thought would be prepared to weigh this without bias. But even here the influence of presuppositions is overwhelming. The majority of such thinkers dismiss the vast mass of material which exists in support of man's persistent belief that death does not end all as if it were unworthy of their attention.

Clearly, however, one presupposition is necessary if we are to believe in survival as probable, or even possible, and that is one that holds the priority of mind over the material order, or at least its relative independence of the material order as we know it. We should add one further requisite—the belief in the significance of values. Only a type of thought which attaches ontological importance to judgments of value is likely to have the basis for a serious argument in favour of the immortal hope. For any profound reason for a future or supernatural life must bring in the thought that the values which we find imperfectly manifested in this present order have some inherent right to persist, and that the conception of their evanescence is intolerable. Perhaps the point would be put more definitely if we said that the problem of the soul's destiny only becomes real and urgent for a philosophy which regards the universe as rational in the sense of having some reason for existing.

Taking, then, the postulate of the truth of Christianity, in its broad sense, let us ask what view a modern Christian may take of the future life? The Christian theist approaches the problem with two beliefs. In the first place he finds God in Christ. And, therefore, for him God is more than the Ground of the Universe, more even than creative will. He is Holy Love, and He manifests His holiness and His love in redemption. The second belief of the Christian theist is the Resurrection of Christ. That is to say, apart from any particular view of the Resurrection, that Christ was not defeated by death, but is alive for evermore. These are the central affirmations of the Christian faith. These, then, are the determining factors in any Christian view of the soul's destiny.

The question at once arises: Is the immortality of the soul a Christian doctrine? By immortality is meant that the soul is inherently and in its own right immortal. This doctrine was maintained by Plato, and through Platonism found an entrance into Christian theology. But it is time that we should rid ourselves of this Platonic bequest. The New Testament knows nothing of the eternity or the indestructibility of the soul. If we are to ask what doctrine is most in harmony with the postulates of Christian theism, it is clear that derived immortality is the one we should choose. Indeed, the view that individual selves are inherently indestructible is hardly compatible with theism, for it would seriously compromise the supremacy of God. The Christian theist is committed to the belief that all things take their origin from, and depend upon, the creative will of God.

Not only is conferred or conditional immortality the view most in harmony with the fundamental assumption of theism, but we must clearly realize that the resurrection of the body is the characteristic Christian doctrine on this subject. We need not accept the traditional imagery in which apocalyptic has clothed this doctrine. But when the clothing which has come from a vanished age is stripped away, the essential thought in this doctrine remains the most reasonable conception of the future life. It is becoming increasingly difficult to maintain that the personal life and experience are something transacted, as it were, in association with the bodily frame, but having no necessary connexion with it.

The old problem of the relation of mind and body has not been solved, but it becomes clear that the sharp antithesis between them is not tolerable. This means that the distinction between mind and body is one which is made within the unity of the personal life, and therefore includes what we mean by body as well as what we mean by mind. And, therefore, it is difficult to maintain any belief in survival of a personal identity which does not include a body. Hence our emphasis on the essential truth of the resurrection of the body. The fact that the doctrine has been presented in crude or even ridiculous forms need not deter us from affirming it in a rational form. And St. Paul has given us a hint of a form in which it can be held, without any reproach of materialism, in his great conception of a spiritual body. This conception is really in harmony with the conclusions of science, which has so dissolved the materiality of matter that there can be no difficulty in believing that the soul's activity builds up a body which is a suitable vehicle of its life.

What conclusions are we to draw from this discussion? It is impossible to harmonize a belief in eternal punishment with Christian theism. We cannot believe that God would hold, in unending existence, human spirits in order to inflict pain upon them. But this does not lead to universalism. What has been said leads rather to the idea of survival as an achievement. The choice of evil, if persisted in, is in conflict with the nature of reality and can only lead to the destruction of the self. This is what is meant by a doctrine of derived or conferred or conditional immortality. And this belief, we have seen, is founded, not on doubtful texts of dubious authority, but on the fundamental conception of God, on which we are agreed. And this is a message which is peculiarly fitted for the present age, which is tired of the conflicting and material utopias presented to it. The Christian religion is incurably other-worldly, and its message for our age is that the destiny of the soul lies in the unseen.

The Words from the Cross.

VI. 'It is finished' (John xix. 30).

By the Very Reverend J. G. Simpson, D.D., Dean of Peterborough.

It is surely unfortunate that *to give up the ghost* should have become an expression bearing no further significance than the simple verb *to die.* Its use in the A.V. sufficiently accounts for this. There is only one instance, Jn 19^{28}, in which it actually represents the phrase which it professes to translate. For, though the language of Mt 27^{50} bears some resemblance, we should there rather read *let go* than *yielded up the ghost,* which is the actual translation of the A.V. The idea in this case is little more than that of losing hold of life, which is practically a variant for dying. The usage in the translation of the O.T. is borrowed from that of the N.T. In this case, there is not a single instance where, as in Jn 19^{30}, the English words are an exact equivalent of the original.

That this assimilation should have taken place in the four narratives of the death of Jesus obscures the force of the phrase, when it occurs in the Fourth Gospel. If in Mark and Luke the word 'expired' had been used, while the words of Matthew had been more accurately translated 'let go his spirit,' the expression used by St. John, which is properly represented by 'gave up the ghost,' would have been invested with its full significance. It means 'he handed over (or consigned) his spirit,' as by a final act of voluntary demission into the hands of God. It is precisely the same word which the Evangelist has already employed to express the official consignment of the body of his prisoner by the procurator to those who were to carry out the capital sentence. '*He delivered him unto them to be crucified*' (Jn 19^{16}).

St. John does not attribute to Jesus the words *In manus tuas.* But in view of the adaptation of Ps 31^{5}, which Lk 23^{46} places in His mouth, it is surely not unreasonable to suppose that John is not merely interpreting the death of Jesus, as he witnessed it, but is actually telling us what Luke conveys by recording the utterance, *Father, into thy hands I commend my spirit.* If that be indeed the case, then we have here one of those instances characteristic of the Fourth Gospel when the Synoptic narrative is implied. So far from sinking into death, the Evangelist means to say, Jesus consciously and in terms delivered over His spirit to the Father, just as He had consigned His mother to the care of the disciple whom He loved. Thus the phrase 'gave up the ghost,' far from being a customary expression to indicate the simple fact of death, differentiates, and is deliberately intended to differentiate, the last act in the career of the Son from all ordinary forms of dying. There is no swoon, no lapse into coma. In the fullness of a life, which no suffering can diminish, Jesus passes into death. The impression thus created is renewed by what follows. When the soldiers, according to custom, came to hasten what in normal cases, like that of the two malefactors, would have been a long and lingering process, by breaking the legs, they found that in that of their principal victim there was no need. 'They saw that he was dead already.' And, when one of them, as though to leave no room for doubt, thrust his spear into the side, the stream of blood and water issuing from the wound was a result so unexpected, that 'he that saw it,' while attesting in consequence the reality of the Lord's death, drew therefrom the inference that this death had quickening power, and was able to invest the circumstance with mystical significance (1 Jn $3^{6, 8}$). Thus, the actual phenomena of the passing of Jesus completely vindicated in the eyes of the disciple the utterance which he attributes to his Master: 'No one taketh it away from me, but I lay it down of myself' (Jn 10^{18}).

All the Synoptists agree that just before Jesus died He cried with a loud voice. This belongs to the common tradition. That this is not the same as the Eli cry, omitted by Luke, but given both by Mark and Matthew in Greek and Aramaic, as though it were the earliest of the seven words to grip the imagination of the Christian community as the characteristic utterance of Calvary, is clear from the fact that both the evangelists who record it say that 'Jesus uttered a loud voice and expired,' while Matthew expressly inserts the word *again* (Mk 15^{37}; cf. Mt 27^{50}). It was, therefore, a second voice, distinct from that of which the content is given, and it was uttered *in articulo mortis*, just before the Lord died. So far as we can see, there is no intention to point the significance of what occurred, but merely to state the fact as it was believed to be. But this fact is in itself remarkable enough. That one who for several long hours had endured the exhaustion of the Cross should then, and that at the very moment of death, have been able to utter a strong cry, similar to that which in the ears of those who heard it had shaped itself into the opening words of the twenty-second psalm, is sufficiently surprising. And if the case of Jesus had so far contradicted expectation that those who came to carry out the crurifragium found their purpose anticipated, experience would suggest that the stupor of dissolution would already have rendered such an exertion of the vital power impossible. It is no wonder that, if this shout was actually heard ringing out from the Cross, the memory of it would be fixed for ever in the minds of those who were present at the last scene.

> By many a death-bed I have been
> And many a sinner's parting seen,
> But never aught like this.

Now, if the eye-witness, upon whose report the Fourth Gospel is based, were himself among those who saw Jesus die, we may be sure that so arresting a circumstance as the last loud cry would not escape his attention. And, if he had anything to add, which would illuminate it, it would be entirely in the manner of the gospel to preserve silence with respect to the former voice, the content of which was sufficiently established in the tradition of the Church, and to report what, if known, would supply an articulate significance to the latter.

Nor are we disappointed. For this is how John fills out the story.

After this, Jesus knowing that all things are now finished, that the scripture might be accomplished, saith, I thirst. There was set there a vessel full of vinegar: so they put a sponge full of the vinegar upon hyssop, and brought it to his mouth. When Jesus therefore had received the vinegar, he said, It is finished: and he bowed his head, and gave up his spirit.

To the whole of this passage the words *It is finished* are central. All the rest revolves round them and is subordinate to them. What goes before is the preface, what follows the natural and appropriate sequel.

First, there is the note of time, linking it on to what immediately precedes it in the narrative, the provision which Jesus makes for His mother—*after this*. This does not necessarily imply that no interval separated the hour of His actual death from the moment when He addressed the Virgin and the beloved disciple. It is inconceivable that this should have happened after the three hours of which the Synoptists speak, when 'there was darkness over all the land.' It is, indeed, not improbable that in the disciple's experience of the Crucifixion these episodes represent successive events. For, though, when it is said that 'from that hour that disciple took (Mary) to his own home,' the statement may be made quite generally, it seems more natural to suppose that the words of Jesus have a precise meaning, and that the disciple understood them as an injunction to lead His mother away. If that be so, the disciple may not have heard the Eli cry at all, which in consequence could not be part of his own individual witness. For him, therefore, the disposal of the mother and the last moments of Jesus may have been actually consecutive. But, be this as it may, the lonely conflict which succeeded the last contact of the Crucified with human relationships, could be known only so far as any utterance of His own gave access to His spirit. For the most part 'the rest is silence.' But at the supreme moment, when the end was almost reached, when to all intents and purposes it had actually arrived, this was revealed to be, not a fate passively though heroically met, but a goal attained, an action completed, a victory won. What had been recorded by others as 'the shout of a king,' is now announced by the disciple as an intelligible and illuminating word. *Jesus said, It is finished.*

The setting in which the artist inserts this precious jewel is so constructed as to enhance its brilliancy, and to leave no doubt as to what the witness regarded as its true meaning and significance. *Jesus*, he says, *knowing that all things are now finished . . . said, It is finished.* No doubt the participial clause is in form an introduction, not to the final proclamation, but to the preliminary expression of a need, which was practically a request, *I thirst.* We are accustomed, and no doubt justifiably, to comment upon this utterance as possessed of an independent value in a series of equal 'words.' But it must not be forgotten that the Fourth Gospel only introduces it by way of approach to the great word on which the writer's mind is fastened, and which he is now making it his business to record. The vinegar held upon the hyssop-stalk to parched lips supplied them with the necessary physical power to sound forth the bell-like utterance which follows. Incidentally, the only comment which the writer makes upon the request is contained in the clause *that the scripture might be accomplished*, and this, as we shall endeavour to see presently, is even more important in its bearing on the central word, than on that to which it primarily refers. The word translated in R.V. *accomplished* is so closely akin to that which is twice rendered by *finished*, that the assonance of the original Greek is unmistakable.

It is quite clear, then, that in the final exclamation of Jesus—the single word He uses is, of course, rightly translated as the perfect passive of a verb, but, as in the English this involves three words, it is almost better represented by a simple participle, Latin *consummatum*, English 'done'!—the writer sees a revelation of the mind of Jesus, and through that of the true character of His death as the crowning act of the mission He had been sent to fulfil. All things were now at last accomplished. This Jesus knew, and, knowing, He gave expression to it.

To this the narrative of the Evangelist has been steadily leading up, more especially from the Feeding of the Five Thousand onward. Jesus is the Son of Man, who came down from heaven, who came forth from God. His mission is to work the works of His Father; His meat to do the will of Him that sent Him, and to accomplish His work. As the Fourth Gospel represents Him, the Lord is always an active and dominant personality at every stage of His progress, shaping and directing the very circumstances, which from any narrower point of view seem to be weaving about His feet an entangling web and to leave Him at best a martyr's crown. But, inasmuch as the Son comes forth from God and goes to God, all that happens to Jesus, including death itself, unlike the common lot of others, falls within the field of choice. Submission with Jesus is only obedience to the Father's will, never acceptance of the inevitable. 'I lay down my life,' he insists, 'that I may take it again. No one taketh it from me, but I lay it down of myself.' For Him, death is an act, and a voluntary act. His hour is His own. It comes, when He wills. The whole of His mortal life, completed as it is by death, is as the Son Himself wills it to be, His instrument for the accomplishment of the Father's work and the casting out of the Prince of this world. That is the issue which is being actively fought out by the Son of Man in His passage through mortality. It is this spiritual reality behind the outward form of the historical events which transforms the Passion of Jesus into an Action and shows the patient Sufferer throughout as a victorious Doer. The 'lifting up' of Jesus upon the Cross from the point of view of the achievement which it consummated is His elevation to that glory which is the reward of His finished work.

What is thus worked out as a transvaluation of all the facts of our Lord's human experience, so that death itself is changed into the victory through death of Him who is the Resurrection and the Life, is, so to speak, the rationalization of those facts recorded in the Synoptic Gospels which appeared unintelligible and paradoxical to those who were the witnesses of His speech and action: His deliberate withdrawal from the field of His beneficent activities and popular teaching; His determination to go to Jerusalem where the chief priests and scribes were preparing for His arrest; His firm declaration that the Son of Man could not accomplish His mission otherwise than by a shameful death; His baffling speech about a rising from the dead. He had, He said, a baptism to be baptized with, which those who had had experience of John's baptism knew not, and was straitened, restrained from perfect liberty of action, till it was accomplished.

It is the High Priestly prayers given in Jn 17 which give full and final expression to the character of the work which the Son had discharged in obedience to the will of the Father. The hour had come—the supreme hour, which was to gather up and complete the results of all previous hours, in which the glory of the Son had been manifested. It was the hour in which the glory, which He had with the Father before the world was, was to rest upon Him in that human nature, in which by dying to it, He had overcome the world, and thus achieved the right, and by consequence the power, of conferring upon all flesh, over which as Son of Man He had received authority, that eternal life, which had been manifested in Him, and which consists in fellowship with Himself and with the Father. Anticipating that death, which could now be nothing else than a transcendent manifestation in liberating victory of eternal life, Jesus thus proclaims His passing: 'I have glorified thee on the earth, having accomplished the work which thou gavest me to do . . . and now I come to thee.'

It is this declaration which the Crucified gathers into a single word of triumph—Done, *Consummatum*, 'It is finished.' 'And he bowed the head, and gave up his spirit.'

But, we must go one step farther in clearing the significance of this laconic but pregnant proclamation of the gospel. *That the Scripture might be accomplished* is the preface with which is introduced the preliminary word, *I thirst.* Here we must begin by recognizing the idiom of the New Testament. We are not to suppose that an utterance, which sufficiently explains itself, was dictated by an intention to fulfil a prediction of the Old Testament. It was the practice of those who reflected on what Jesus said or did or suffered to detect even in the most superficial resemblances a correspondence with, or fulfilment of, the Old Testament Scriptures. This might be, and no doubt was conceived as dependent on the will and purpose of God. And in that sense it might be true to say that the words mean that Jesus said *I thirst,* in order that the Scripture might be accomplished. But not, of course, in the sense that Jesus Himself preferred a natural and obvious request for the sophisticated purpose of procuring a fulfilment of Ps 69[21], 'When I was thirsty, they gave me vinegar to drink.' What it does mean is that, when the disciple witnessed, or, at any rate, reflected upon what occurred, he perceived in it an impressive token of the Messiahship of Jesus. It was the accomplishment of Scripture, or, in other words, the consummation of a progressive process of Divine action, that was reached in the death of Him who is the Son. When, therefore, Jesus said, *It is finished,* He attested the completion in His own Person and Work of the Divine purpose.

It will be noted that at this supreme point of his testimony, the disciple seems to see the Scriptures fulfilling themselves at every turn. Not only does he find in the draught of vinegar a fulfilment of Ps 69[21], but, in connexion with the statement that 'they brake not his legs,' he cites the provision of the Law with regard to the paschal lamb (Ex 12[46]; cf. Is 53[7]); and the pierced side recalls the words of one of the prophecies appended to Zechariah, *They shall look on him* (or, see Zec 12[10] R.V., *unto me*) *whom they pierced.* This is not an occasion to enter upon the general question of the validity of the appeal to the Old Testament which is a prominent feature throughout the New, and which often assumes what to the modern mind appear far-fetched and unconvincing forms. But this at least must be said, that in searching the Scriptures for anticipations of the work of the Redeemer, the apostolic interpreters of the gospel are only attempting to follow the clue suggested by the Master Himself, when 'he interpreted to them in all the scriptures the things concerning himself' (Lk 24[27]). And there can be little doubt that Jesus realized His own vocation as the suffering Servant who was also the Son (see Mk 1[11], Lk 9[35] with R.V. marg. ref.) through meditation upon the expectation of redemption and the method of its achievement exhibited in the Law and the Prophets and the Psalms.

This lends significance to the use made by Jesus upon the Cross of the opening sentence of the twenty-second Psalm, which the synoptic tradition is careful to reproduce in the very language in which it was uttered. If it is too much to say that our Lord intended by this word to identify His own experience with that depicted in the Psalm, we are at least entitled to point out that most of the details of the Crucifixion noted by Mk., the offering of wine mingled with myrrh (Mt. gall), the parting of the garments, the railing and wagging of the head, vividly recall the picture of suffering presented in this Psalm and Ps 69. It is difficult to resist the impression that the apostolic community, in which the identification of Jesus with the Servant in Is 2 was immediately made, thought of the Cross thus from the beginning. Upon it the Son of Man wrought redemption for His people through death.

Now it is remarkable that the only other instance besides those already noted, in which the Fourth Gospel in the narrative of the Crucifixion cites the Old Testament, is that where the twenty-second Psalm is quoted in relation to the parting of the garments. As in the case of the vinegar, so here the fulfilment of Scripture is given as the reason for what happens. *These things, therefore, the soldiers did* (Jn 19[24]). May not the Evangelist be following out the suggestion of the Eli cry in showing us the great Passion Psalm as realizing itself on Calvary even in its more superficial details? If now we turn to this psalm and follow its course, a new light seems to fall upon the word, which must have followed the former loud cry, in the speech of Golgotha—*It is finished.*

The Psalm, then, till just beyond the middle of v.[21], proceeds in the key set by the opening question —*Why hast thou forsaken me?*—till a cry arises as out of the deep—'Save me from the lion's mouth; yea, from the horns of the wild oxen——' Here there follows a sharp aposiopesis. *Deliver me* are the words required to finish the appeal. But in a moment comes the change from the minor to a triumphant major key. A glow of joyous feeling attests the answer which has all but anticipated the petition—*thou hast answered me.*

The last ten verses are the glad proclamation of a Divine victory, a mighty deliverance, in which the kingdom of Jehovah, the congregation in which the brethren shall sing praise and eat the bread of thankfulness, is established; while one generation after another takes up the publication of the good news first made by the sufferer himself. *They shall come and shall declare his righteousness unto a people that shall be born, that he hath done it* (v.[31]).

God hath done it. Here surely in the Passion Psalm is expressed, not only the sorrow concentrated in the Eli cry, but that good news compressed into the mighty word *Done,* which is the epitome not only of Calvary itself, but of the mission of the Son, the reconciliation wrought by God in His dealings with the world. Whether to the mind of the disciple, who had just cited it, and who was evidently thinking of the sixty-ninth in the immediate context, the twenty-second Psalm was actually present when he reported that *Jesus said, It is finished,* cannot, of course be demonstrated. But there can surely be no question that in this word he recognized what is the essence of all evangelical preaching, the proclamation of the completed sacrifice, 'the finished work of Christ.'

Literature.

INDIA TO-DAY.

The history of India is long and eventful. But there are those with knowledge who believe that one of the darkest periods that she has ever known is that through which she is passing now. For outsiders it is difficult to form a true and adequate conception of what is really happening in the minds of those three hundred and nineteen millions with their wild welter of conflicting hopes and fears and dreams. Even Dr. Nicol Macnicol, that outstanding authority, confesses that he finds it hard to photograph it for us. But happily he has tried; and his attempt is one of the most interesting and informing books on India that we possess. He takes his title, *India in the Dark Wood* (Edinburgh House Press; 2s. 6d. net), from that passage in Dante where, in the thick of a wild forest, he looks up and sees the eternal stars shining to guide him. Just so is it with India; and she, too, will struggle through her present troubles, led by the light that has never failed her, to a great and glorious new day. This is the book of an expert with abounding first-hand knowledge; and, what is even rarer, a sureness of understanding sympathy with all manner of folk that impresses and sometimes shames. The work falls into two main sections with an important epilogue. There is a really masterly study of non-Christian India, and in particular of its religious mind. It is, indeed, a tangled skein. But patiently these skilful fingers unravel it, thread by thread, till the confusion falls apart before our minds. Thirty pages deal with that small English-educated minority of some two and a half millions who by their clamour draw and hold men's eyes. The educated-groping so they are entitled. What strikes one here is that the proud claim of thirty years ago that India would be 'the "guru" of the earth' is being abandoned: that there is a revolt against religion: that, whereas a generation back the leaders in social reform were deeply spiritual men, to-day, with a few notable exceptions, it is not so. True, there are not a few most interesting attempts to revivify the old Indian faith, here outlined for us, like the Ramakrishna Mission; and the inrush of 'a new sense of responsibility for others' in place of the brooding type of spirituality so characteristic of its past. But 'Nationalism has taken the place of Religion' in the educated mind of India; and the idea of the brotherhood of all mankind, which had dawned upon it, bids fair to dwindle—or has done so—into a love of Indians as Indians, no more. 'The complete abandonment of all religion, a vague but humanitarian agnosticism, a religion of patriotism, a Hinduism moralized and brought up-to-date, these appear to be some of the paths in the dark wood that the educated classes in India are pursuing.' There are others. Many are looking with an intense admiration towards Jesus Christ, and

'Christian sentiment has become so widely diffused in educated India that it is scarcely realized not to be a native product.' And, indeed, adds Dr. Macnicol, 'we have no right to claim it always as Christian,' for India knew more than was supposed.

As to the illiterate masses, they are 'stirring in their sleep.' Picking his way among strangely diverse accounts of them, our author draws a grim grey picture of their lives and minds, yet with a hope that will keep breaking through. For did not mighty spirits like Kabir and Tukaram spring from this very soil? But the real hope lies in the women, who at long last are aroused. There is a moving study of the splendour and the horror of the Indian woman's life, and of the new thoughts that are awake and crying out in her affectionate and loyal heart. Upon the whole, one will not readily find a more vivid picture of Indian mentality to-day than in this first section of some one hundred pages.

The second deals with the Indian Christian Church, or rather with the section of it which is the outcome of the missionary efforts of the non-Roman Churches of the West. This numbers some two and three-quarter million souls. Here, too, we come on change and transition, which, if rightly handled, should ultimately have large and beneficent results. Meantime things are not easy. Nationalism has touched the Christians no less than others of their race. A man like Narayan Sheshadri, who declared 'I am just a black Scotchman,' is out of date; scholars like Professor K. M. Banerjea, who found nothing in the ancient scriptures of their people but elaborated error and misrule, have given place to others who exult in the many proofs that that light that lighteth every man that cometh into the world has shone brightly into the hearts of many saints and sages of their land. There is in many quarters an impatience with the presence of foreign missionaries, and almost everywhere a refusal to look at Christ through Western eyes. All that in the Church 'articulate and educated,' while in the Church 'inarticulate and in bondage' are further difficulties not easy of solution. Christianity, to its honour, stretched out its hands to the most hopeless classes, and it has had a rich reward. But at a price; for those unhappy souls are not easily raised to proofs of the moral worth and power of their new faith. And sometimes the Church itself has failed in courage, and has over-compromised with the existing evils. There are places, for example, where Christians, caste and outcaste, will not sit down together at the Table of their Lord. Still there is impressive evidence of what Christianity can do to raise and change the most set natures in the face of every difficulty. In view of the glib talk of how Christianity spoils the native, it is well to have official evidence like that of the Census Officer of the United Provinces (1911) that their Hindu fellows frankly confess the Christians are better men than they are themselves, and the like.

Finally, there comes an interesting discussion on why have foreign missions in face of the ethical achievements of the other faiths. In the end of his sane and balanced statement Dr. Macnicol emphasizes 'the given-ness of Christianity'—that it is not so much the record of man's search for God as of God's search for us; and the fact of Christ, 'an historical person who is known in personal fellowship and affection.' These two are being underlined in every mission field to-day, but this last chapter repays study.

A timely book, scholarly and most informing, and in its honesty and sympathy almost too slow to claim for Christianity its full share in such advances as are taking place.

PHILOSOPHICAL THEOLOGY.

We cordially welcome this second volume of *Philosophical Theology*, by Dr. F. R. Tennant (Cambridge University Press; 15s. net). Taken along with the first volume it offers an imposing wealth of sound and solid reasoning in favour of a theistic view of the universe. While the first volume is more preparatory, this is more positive and constructive in its method, and leaves on the mind a sense of the weight and value, indeed of the indispensableness of those arguments which men have more or less always felt as substantiating God's existence and providence. This is in the best sense of the word a theodicy based on rational grounds, clearly and consecutively argued from point to point, and moving towards a grand conclusion with a cumulative dignity which produces on the reader a sense of sublimity. In an age where appeals to the subconscious and to intuitions are rife it is gratifying to come across a thinker who can give a reason for the faith of those who are constrained to believe in God. Even the value-arguments for God's existence and character play but a minor rôle, for to Dr. Tennant they appear to be too subjective, and he wishes to marshal before us only what the universal reason of man can verify. The dignity and the restraint of the reasoning place this volume and its predecessor in a very high category, and our sincere hope is that not only apologetic theologians but philosophers of all schools will read, weigh, and inwardly digest these notable productions.

The first three chapters belong really in their essence to the first volume, and from ch. iv. onwards we have a worthy handling of the old arguments for God's existence presented in the light of modern knowledge. The only argument that does not seem to appeal to Dr. Tennant is the so-called ontological which he dismisses in a paragraph or two—and yet we think he could have restated this argument also if he had approached it with the insight and sympathy with which, say, he approaches the teleological. Much of the book inevitably is taken up with the clarifying of concepts such as eternity, omnipotence, personality, infinitude, etc., as applied to God, and all along he is concerned to do justice to man's freedom and ethical nature—indeed, when it comes to an antinomy as between foreknowledge in God and freedom in man, he is more ready to sacrifice God than man—a procedure with which we do not agree, for it seems to us that from the point of view of religion God's perfection is more valuable for man's faith than, say, freewill is—at any rate, we would have liked an explanation of what freedom is in the proportion that he gives to the explaining of foreknowledge. Is it true, for instance, to say that foreknowledge has a meaning only when we regard reality as mechanically determined? We feel the same limitation in the writer's position in his neglect of the great concepts of sin and grace. His insistence on man's ethical nature is so great that it minimizes the religious man's experience of grace—which is a higher category surely: in short, the direct activity of God in grace and revelation and in redemption is a primary datum for religious experience. God's activity from the religious point of view is not a uniform horizontal activity—but rather in the nature of illapses. We doubt if otherwise the personality of God can be held and His working in history and the soul understood and appreciated. To put the matter historically, Dr. Tennant does justice to the Pelagian view; we have grave doubts if he does justice to the Augustinian. And yet there can be little doubt that the latter is truer to experience and philosophically more satisfying.

But our purpose is not to criticise but to appreciate, and appreciation in this case is a labour of love. The Appendices at the close of this volume are valuable, and altogether this is a noble book, and we congratulate the writer on the ability of his achievement.

BEYOND AGNOSTICISM.

A thoughtful book with the above title has been written by Bernard Iddings Bell, Warden of St. Stephen's College, Columbia University (Allen & Unwin; 5s. net). Its general thesis is that knowledge is not enough; 'it is the things beyond the intellect that make life worth while, that engender poetry, romance, awe, reverence,' and mind alone will never carry us into the heart of reality. The book is therefore in part a polemic against those who regard science as the ultimate authority; the religion of the future, it is contended, will be based upon neither science nor philosophy. It is written to help the modern man out of his attitude of bored cynicism, and it is written by one who well understands the mood he would combat and who has himself fought his way out of it. He argues with much force against those who are continually reminding us that we are beasts, but who forget that from this it does not follow that we are nothing more than beasts—that we are animals who can think and aspire and revolt against being animals, as presumably no mere animal could do. The peculiarity of our age is not that men doubt the love or even the existence of God, but that in large numbers they doubt the worth-whileness of life itself; and even where the depths of cynicism have not been sounded, Jesus is 'the antithesis of all that our day deems of most worth.'

Mr. Bell finds that Jesus holds the key to the secret of the universe. That secret lies in personality, and 'Christianity offers Jesus as ultimate personality in human terms.' He puts it very unambiguously when he says, 'Jesus is our God, the only God we human beings can possibly understand.' And, as in worship he believes that it is not enough that religious feeling be not dissipated—it must be concentrated—he believes very strongly in sacramentalism. 'It is highly significant that in every Communion in Christendom to-day, Protestant as well as Catholic, the force and power and vigour seem largely concentrated in that group which is stressing sacramentalism,' and he italicizes the following words, 'If Protestantism is to survive, many of us believe, it too must revive sacramentalism in its devotional aspects; it too must revive the act of worship. That is to say, it must become again essentially Catholic.'

Mr. Bell offers some interesting suggestions for the restoration of sound worship—among others that the sermon should be short, and placed well forward, never at the end of the service, and that there should be 'large bonfires of trashy hymnals.'

The proof-reading has not been perfect; 'appetit*i*es' (p. 26) should be corrected; *ἡ θύβις τέλος ἐδτί* (p. 41) is hardly what Aristotle wrote; and it is a real pity that so good a book should be marred by the pathetically amusing reference to Wordsworth's 'Ode on the Intimations of *Immorality*' (!), where, we are told, that great poet was 'at his best' (p. 123).

IDENTITY AND REALITY.

The editor of the Library of Philosophy, Dr. Muirhead, writes a brief note to *Identity and Reality*, by Mr. Emile Meyerson, translated by Kate Loewenberg (Allen & Unwin; 16s. net), to introduce the writer to the English-speaking student, and in a short preface, pleasing for its modesty, the author introduces himself and explains the aim of his book.

Although it appeared thirty-two years ago in its original French form and is translated as it then appeared, it is a valuable contribution to a series containing many noteworthy volumes. We suspect also that the translator has done her work so well that little or nothing is lost by its appearance in English. Considering the native difficulty of the subject of Epistemology with which the book deals, this is in itself a remarkable achievement, and we congratulate the translator.

The thesis of the writer is that metaphysics is indispensable—an unquenchable urge making us all metaphysicians whether we know it or not. He shows that the attempt of Comte and Mach and others to make science deal only with phenomena without raising the question of real causes is doomed to failure, and is, besides, detrimental to science itself—it gives you only an eternal flux with nothing flowing—with no reality. When you raise the question of cause, again, you long for permanence for the unchangeable, and these two movements run through all cognitive experience.

This thesis is pursued by the writer with a remorseless relentlessness through all spheres of mental activity—both are necessary, yet each alone leads to absurdity. He illustrates with so many examples from the history of scientific progress that the volume becomes a kind of thesaurus of chief stadia in scientific advance from the early Greeks to the present day. For this alone the work is of no small value. Although the book is best described as an epistemology of science, it is too narrow in its thesis to justify fully this description; but as far as it goes it is a real contribution to the subject, and it is written with such quiet strength and fullness of knowledge that it produces a pleasing impression that the writer has a great deal more to say of real value on ultimate questions.

The theologian will especially welcome the able critique and rejection of mechanism as an explanation of human knowledge or even of sensation—and also the writer's seeming emphasis on the reality of freedom as an integral part of man's life.

A GOOD BOOK ON RELIGIOUS PSYCHOLOGY.

'There is always room at the top,' and this applies to literature as well as to ambition. We have had so many 'popular' books on psychology, which repeat the well-worn cliches, that one turns to still another with a sense of weariness. But this feeling is soon dispelled by *Psychology's Defence of the Faith*, by Mr. David Yellowlees, M.B., Ch.B. (S.C.M.; 5s. net). Dr. Yellowlees is in an eminent degree fitted for his task. He is a well-known psychological expert with an extensive practice. He combines knowledge with common sense and a keen sense of humour, and he is a deeply (but sanely) religious man. The result of this somewhat unique combination of gifts, applied to the exposition of the relations of psychology and religion, is a book of fascinating interest and immense value. How well balanced Dr. Yellowlees is may be seen in his estimate of Freud. Most of us, after reading Freud's notorious chapter on sex in children, have conceived a sort of loathing for the man and all his works. But Dr. Yellowlees helps us to understand the real facts. He freely admits the great services Freud has rendered, and in particular points out the broad psychic meaning Freud attaches to sex, and at the same time puts his finger on the weak places in Freud's system.

It would be difficult to name any book which gives a more coherent and enlightening view of modern psychology and its discoveries and theories in a simple fashion. Dr. Yellowlees does not tie us up in a tangle of detail, but takes the big things, the things that matter, and explains them in a way any of us can follow. His illustrations are always pat and really illuminating, though we might wish for more of them. On one point we might venture a criticism. The author, in answer to the question: 'Is there a religious instinct?' answers, 'If you want it in a word, No.' On this point he bows before the storm of the new psychologists. And on this point he is surely wrong. Religion is as deep-seated as pugnacity, or even as sex. It is an elemental thing in human nature, and if this be so, why not call it an instinct? Dr. Yellowlees admits there is an 'innate capacity' and 'something, quite elemental, which is one main root of religion.' But is this not just an instinct? In the case of Dr. Yellowlees the point is not important, because he agrees that the root of religion is something primary and irreducible in the human mind. But the denial in the case of others is much more significant, and the matter is important because the case for religious education largely rests on it.

When the author passes from his exposition of psychology to its relations with religion, he becomes even more helpful and effective. And these chapters on religious experience, on religion as sublimation and on the justification of faith, are as good as we could wish. It is a pleasure to praise a book like this, for it will bring light and power, and probably in many cases peace, into the lives of many who are fortunate enough to possess it.

INTUITIONAL PHILOSOPHY.

Mr. Edmond Holmes, who has already a number of books to his credit, has written recently a vigorous, incisive, and interesting work under the title *Philosophy without Metaphysics* (Allen & Unwin; 7s. 6d. net). It is his complaint against metaphysics that it essays the task of philosophy, which is to understand the universe by the aid of the intellect alone. This is clearly evidenced in 'logical metaphysics,' of which Mr. Bradley gives us a notable example in his 'Appearance and Reality.' But it also appears in 'empirical metaphysics,' as exemplified by Professor Alexander in his 'Space, Time, and Deity,' and by the New Realism in general. Nor is this reliance upon the intellect alone and unaided confined to these academic or professional types of metaphysics. It is also to be found in the more popular thought upon the Supreme Problem; and this is illustrated by Supernaturalism, Materialism, and Agnosticism. The agnostic attitude is characterized as 'an admission by a whole-hearted intellectualist that intellect cannot, in any respect or degree, understand the universe—an admission, by one who has tried to think metaphysically, of the inherent futility of metaphysics.'

Without pausing to consider whether Agnosticism as a whole is rightly classed as 'popular metaphysics,' we go on to ask, What is Mr. Holmes's 'philosophy without metaphysics'? The answer is that the quest of wisdom or understanding is a task which demands not the exercise, whether specialized or not, of one mental function, but the co-operation of all man's higher powers. The true philosophy is 'intuitional philosophy,' in which intellect and feeling are combined, or, to express it otherwise, in which prophecy and mysticism are blended together. When there is a perfect harmony between prophecy and mysticism we have the true philosopher, the whole-hearted lover of wisdom, who speaks to his fellow-men, not in the jargon of metaphysics, but in that universal language which emotion kindled by vision finds for itself. As being the greatest of mystics and the greatest of prophets, Christ was the greatest of spiritual teachers.

Without pausing to consider whether Christ is rightly named 'the greatest of mystics,' we proceed to observe that if metaphysical philosophies are futile, 'intuitional philosophy' appears to be a somewhat negative and barren affair. Mr. Holmes is better in criticism than in construction. All that he can say for the intuitionalist appears to be this, that he is one who refuses to specialize in philosophy, and who believes that the Supreme Problem is to be taken up by the whole man, 'working by methods which are best known to his inner self.' The cultivation of 'philosophy without metaphysics' would thus seem to be comparable to the cultivation of 'Greek without tears!' While we say this, we should like to see Mr. Holmes developing the 'unformulated creed' which he formulates in paradoxical terms at the close of his volume.

OUTLINES OF A CHRISTIAN PHILOSOPHY.

Most people would agree with Mr. Ferguson in *Outlines of a Christian Philosophy* (Williams & Norgate; 7s. 6d. net), when he echoes the wishes of Bishop Gore and Dr. Matthews for a Christian philosophy. Such a philosophy is, indeed, a consummation devoutly to be wished; but perhaps the few who proclaim that such a philosophy is impossible will be more than ever convinced in their doubts by the reading of this gallant attempt to meet that need. Mr. Ferguson has had an excitable spiritual history—from atheism to theosophy—and from Unitarianism to Catholic Christianity, and here he philosophizes on the main doctrines of Christianity. He starts with an implicit acceptance of the speculative theories of modern science regarding the 'ether' which to him seems to annihilate materialism; and with a thorough faith in 'intuition.' By the spirituality of the ether he justifies the resurrection of Christ—but neither the ether nor intuition can in our opinion give the factual truth of that dogma. Can intuition also give us the amazing revelations concerning the Trinity and the destiny of man which the author gives us here? In spite of his disclaiming of 'authority' either in Scripture or Church, we doubt if he could come to his positive Christian dogmas by intuition alone, and we more than suspect that what commands assent in his views is really the deposit of specific authoritative revelation. While we admire the courage of the author and pay homage to his desire for truth, there are a few points where we fail to be convinced.

(1) His position that sin is an inevitable quality of finite beings. This, in our opinion, is fatalism of the most terrible kind—for if it be true, we can never be rid of it, for we shall never be anything but finite here or hereafter; nor does the possession of freedom make sin inevitable; for God in the highest sense has freedom, yet without sin.

(2) He works largely with evolution and maintains that all life works towards man, and that the lower forms of life will ultimately become human and Christian. This is an appalling thought, and would involve the notion that extinct creatures like the dinosaur or ichthyosaurus are being even now humanized and Christianized somewhere. His view of derelict men is easier to believe. This is what he says (p. 176): 'Along with these derelicts of humanity there will also go the whole of the lowest creation, which will then rise to the position of this present higher one'; by which he means that in an extra-mundane sphere they will be evolved into the spirits of just men made perfect. It is difficult to envisage this for the lower creatures, even if you grant greater intuition than many can lay claim to.

(3) One of his cardinal principles is the doctrine of reincarnation. The inequalities of this present life at birth can only be explained on this view, and also on it original sin in every shape can be explained away. To be born in a palace is due to merit from a previous existence, and to be born in a slum is demerit from the same—and yet Jesus was born in a stable, and Martin Luther in an inn on a market day. This principle of reincarnation is not a passing idea of the writer, but perhaps the cardinal doctrine of his system. The merit of Christianity is that it does away with this wheel of existence and gives eternal life, but those who die without being Christian or spiritual are transferred at the final judgment to another sphere where the process of reincarnation continues until they also can attain the victory over it. It is difficult on this theory to account for new souls at all, and it makes eternity, as Plato saw, work backwards as well as forwards and thus makes it more difficult to account for sin, and the present order, than ever. The Christian dogmas of the writer are better, we feel, than his philosophy of them, and yet with his effort to work out such a philosophy most men would sympathize even when they cannot consent.

THE FUTURE OF RELIGION.

There are two things that characterize much of the religious literature which America produces. One is its tendency to run to extremes. Fundamentalism is nowhere so traditional as in America, and liberalism is nowhere so 'wild.' The other tendency is towards wordiness. One is often carried on in a foaming tide of words, chapter after chapter, when the message of a book might easily be compressed into a few pages. Both these characteristics are illustrated in a new series of volumes which has been projected and of which the first two are published. It is called 'Religion and the Modern Age' Series. The introductory volume is entitled *Religion and the Modern World*, by Mr. John Herman Randall and Mr. John Herman Randall, Jr. (Williams & Norgate; 5s. net). The drift of this book may be stated shortly. We are faced with a new world. What is to be the fate of religion in this world? Both traditional orthodoxy and religious liberalism are inadequate to the demands of to-day. The religion of the future must start from the sciences of man, and must proceed, not in terms of a nineteenth-century philosophy trying to escape from the scientific spirit, but in terms of a twentieth-century philosophy trying to use it.

It is clear that in this new religion there will be no place for miracles or supernaturalism, for an infallible revelation, or even for 'a transcendental realm of final religious or moral truth.' That is fairly comprehensive, and one is eager to know of anything that can be called religious for which there *will* be a place. Apparently the new religion will be a combination of beauty and righteousness, appealing largely to emotion, for, 'after all, beliefs are not the primary element of the religious life.'

The second volume of the series is called *Religion in an Age of Science*, by Mr. Edwin A. Burtt, Ph.D. (5s. net). There is a good deal of the same kind of thing here. Religion has had its great periods of conflict, and always there is the despairing cry of '*sauve qui peut.*' Science goes on grimly advancing, and religious people go on asking, 'How much can I still believe?' The reconciliation between science and religion will never come about till we realize the nature of the conflict. The ideal of science is intellectual honesty, that of religion personal salvation. And we must resolve this conflict of ideals. This we must do by 'remoulding religion into harmony with the interests of science.' Let us proceed to do this, and we shall find that religion and science converge into one in their 'brooding ideal and informing spirit' which is love, and this love comes from science, its 'zeal for social universality' and its 'attitude of live freedom and unflinching honesty.' There will be a church for this new religion, but it must not be assumed that even the existence of God is a necessary belief for membership.

Of course there is a great deal more than this in these books. There are reviews of the past, and discussions of the meaning of science and philosophy. But what we have written is a fair summary of the trend and conclusions of the books. They are full of crude dogmatisms, like the assertion, for example, that 'an ideal of perfection can never reside in the past,' or, again, like the reference to the 'abysmal ignorance' of men like Professor J. Arthur Thomson and Sir Oliver Lodge. It is difficult to assess the value of such books as these. If they are to be judged as contributions to any kind of positive religion which can either enlighten or help mankind, then we must regretfully say, with every disposition to welcome anything that has any kind of positive message, that they are worth nothing at all.

HAUNTING EDINBURGH.

We spend many happy holiday hours with books, but can hardly call to mind any better spent than those with Miss Grierson's fascinating volume, *Haunting Edinburgh* (Lane; 20s.). The spirit of the old city and of its people, mediæval and modern, is beautifully expressed, as vividly by the letterpress as by Miss Cameron's charming sketches and plates. The colourful scenes from Scottish history bring home to one the fact, forgotten by the average reader, that the old city was once the seat of one of the most brilliant courts in Europe, and explain in a measure why she retains to this day the aura of an aristocratic and romantic past. A volume to treasure for those of us who have seen many cities and still think 'Auld Reekie' without her peer in Europe.

In defence of the thesis that all true religion is accompanied by a considerate regard for the needs of others, Mr. Frank Kingdon has written a stimulating and informing book entitled *Humane Religion* (Abingdon Press; $2.50). The thesis is grounded on the teaching of the Bible, in the exposition of which it is shown that all its great characters from the patriarchs to Paul—and, of course, most notably Jesus—recognize interest in social welfare as an indispensable expression of religion. Mr. Kingdon then deals with the teaching of the philosophers from Plato and Plotinus to Bertrand Russell and Eddington, and shows that the great formative thinkers confirm the position of Jesus. This interesting survey of religious and philosophical history is followed by a section which deals specifically with our modern problems in the light of the general thesis of the book. These problems are the Social Ideal of Christianity, the Family, Patriotism, World Peace, Education, Industry, Leisure, and the writer points to the Christian solution of them. The book is a powerful and reasoned defence of the superiority of human values to property rights or merely institutional values.

Concentration on one aspect of a subject may easily lead to over-emphasis, but it would be impossible, according to Mr. Kingdon, to over-emphasize the socio-ethical implications of religion; from his point of view, therefore, he is thoroughly justified in characterizing as the main fact of the Reformation the passionate desire of the Reformers to 'break down an institution which they believed to be a social menace.' On this book could readily be built by the discerning preacher an instructive series of sermons, which would furnish his congregation with valuable historical knowledge and real spiritual stimulus.

It may seem late in the day to publish another *Life of John Wilkes* (Allen & Unwin; 10s. 6d. net), that notorious profligate in an age of profligacy, but the author, Mr. O. A. Sherrard, justifies it on the ground that he 'left as his legacy to England a new conception of liberty, the Constitution, the sacredness of laws, and the meaning of representation' in Parliament. John Richard Green, in his 'History of the English People,' points out that by a singular irony of fortune this profane, licentious, and agreeable rake became the chief instrument in bringing about three of the greatest advances which our Constitution has ever made. He woke the nation to a conviction of the need for Parliamentary reform, by his defence of the rights of constituencies against the despotism of an unreformed House of Commons. He took the lead in the struggle which put an end to the secrecy of Parliamentary proceedings, and he was the first person as the Lord Mayor of the City of London to establish the right of the Press to discuss public affairs. King George the Third and the most servile of his ministers did their utmost by prosecution, persecution, and imprisonment to suppress him, but first as the M.P. for Middlesex elected again and again, and later as Lord Mayor of London, he successfully defied King and Parliament until 'Wilkes and Liberty' became a popular cry throughout the country. Mr. Sherrard does nothing to conceal or extenuate this man's profligate amours, and but for the fact that he was unstable as water he might have signalized his career in the House of Commons by overthrowing that obstinacy of the King that caused the country the loss of the United States of America.

Selected Essays of J. B. Bury (Cambridge University Press; 12s. 6d. net) is a volume which appeals not only to the scholar but also to the general reader. It is edited by Mr. Harold Temperley, who supplies an Introduction which treats of the historical ideas of the late Professor J. B. Bury, Lord Acton's distinguished successor at Cambridge, and throws light upon the collection of essays which follows. These are ten in number, belonging to different periods of Bury's historical career. The first five, including 'The Science of History,' 'Darwinism and History,' and 'Cleopatra's Nose,' offer for the first time within the limits of one volume a systematic survey of Bury's views on the general scope and method of history. Many will also turn with interest to the essay on 'The Trial of Socrates,' and to that on the 'Roman Emperors from Basil II. to Isaac Komnênos,' by far the longest. The value of the volume is increased by reason of the fact that only one of the essays is still in print, and that some of them are not accessible even in well-known libraries.

Though Bury laid down that history was a science to be studied by scientific methods, he did not believe that it proceeded wholly along fixed lines, as some philosophers of history have thought. The theory of 'contingency' bulks largely in his later studies. But contingencies will become less important in human evolution through the increase of experience and the growth of democratic societies. 'It appears probable that as time advances, the fates of nations will become more and more independent of accidents, whether more or less serious than the pretty face of Anne Boleyn or the shape of Cleopatra's nose.'

A book in which the doctrine of the resurrection of the body is defended is very welcome to many. And in *The Resurrection of the Dead*, the Dean of Chester, the Rev. F. S. M. Bennett, essays this task (Chapman & Hall; 5s. net). His two main propositions are (1) that natural immortality is no part of the Christian creed, and is not true. Biology disproves it, for while you can divide the organism man for purposes of thought, you cannot divide him for any other purpose; and (2) the Fall is not a painful deduction from an historic myth, but a properly scientific hypothesis to explain the facts of experience. If there was a racial divergence, it must have been an organic divergence, and only an organic recovery can put things right. At His resurrection, Christ went back to His transfiguration body, and we by God's grace can turn again towards that same kind of body, which would have been ours but for the Fall. The result seems to be a definite vote in favour of 'conditional resurrection.' The book is interesting and able.

In *A People's Book of Saints* (Longmans; 7s. 6d. net), by Mr. J. Alick Bouquet, the stories of some of the Saints of Christendom—thirty-nine of them in all, drawn from the centuries between the second and the seventeenth—are told simply and lovingly, often indeed naïvely. It is the writer's conviction that we do not think enough about the Saints. The list of those here held up to our grateful remembrance begins with Ignatius and ends with Francis de Sales, but the majority of the names on it are those of English Saints. The volume is embellished with sixteen beautiful photographic illustrations.

Philip cometh to Andrew, by the Rev. Bernard Clements, O.S.B., Rector of St. Augustine's Theological College, Kumasi, West Africa (Longmans; 3s. 6d. net), is a collection of sermons and addresses given by the author, some in England, some in Africa, together with some Notes on Prayer and Penitence prepared for his theological (native) students in St. Augustine's College. The point of view is very High Church, and it is both amusing and pathetic to see the preacher, in dealing with the question of reunion, struggling between the Scylla of his broad spirit and the Charybdis of his particular creed. But the addresses are informed with a spirit of real piety, and we cannot help loving the preacher for his devotion, his sincerity, and his single-minded concentration on his object. A good man, and a wise one, is behind all these sermons, and they will do good wherever they go.

A new volume on the Fourth Gospel has been published by the Rev. Edward Mears, M.A., Warden of the Brotherhood of St. Paul at Little Bardfield, Essex. It is entitled *The Gospel of St. John* (Murray; 7s. 6d. net), and is intended to suit the needs of Ordinands or 'lay-folk' possessing little or no knowledge of Greek. The work is in three parts. The first part is an 'Introduction.' In it the view is set forth that the author of the Fourth Gospel is not John the Apostle, son of Zebedee, but a younger John of Jerusalem; and that he solved the problem of presenting the Saviour by the method of the Dialogue, customary among Jewish rabbis and in the schools of Gentile philosophy. The method would be well understood not only at Ephesus, where according to tradition the Gospel was published, but throughout Palestine, Syria, and the rest of Asia Minor. The second part contains the Gospel in English, rearranged and literally translated. The rearrangement follows upon the author's conviction that displacements have occurred in the Gospel. The literal translation will be welcomed by Ordinands and others. The third part consists of a Commentary, in which the notes are for the most part brief, useful, and to the point. The whole book is inspired by belief in the Catholic faith concerning the Person of Jesus Christ. It appears to us that it admirably fulfils its purpose.

The latest volume of the 'Cole Lectures,' a foundation in Vanderbilt University, is *Man's Social Destiny in the Light of Science*, by Dr. C. A. Ellwood, Professor of Sociology in the University of Missouri (S.C.M.; 5s. net). It is an interesting discussion of the problem which seems to obsess American writers, What is to happen to the great values of life in the presence of modern industrialism and science? Professor Ellwood is an optimist with a cheerful outlook on the future. He begins with a picture of the present discontents and our present resources, and then proceeds to deal with the future of science, government, education, and religion. He has great hopes of science, when it has thrown off its own orthodoxy, which is a devotion to 'facts.' He defines science as 'tested knowledge,' a formula that few would accept, and hopes to see this newly-defined science extending its sway to all fields, with beneficent results. The review thus undertaken is marked by a calm competence and breadth of view which, whether one follows all his conclusions or not, is both helpful and enlightening.

◆

The Mind of Christ on Moral Problems of To-day.

IV.

Education and Religion.

By the Reverend F. J. Rae, M.A., Director of Religious Instruction,
Aberdeen Training Centre for Teachers.

Most people who are really interested in any subject regard it as the most urgent problem of the day, and educationists are no exception. In the matter of education we are in a fluid, experimental, transitional stage, but it would not be untrue to say that there has been a more solid advance to agreement in regard to the religious element in education than on almost any other aspect of the subject. It is true we are far from the goal. It is highly probable, to borrow some famous words of R. L. S., that there is no such place. But at any rate we have reached some general conclusions, and it is the humble aim of this paper to record some of these. Speaking of the goal, or the ideal in education, there can be no doubt about what that intangible and impossible thing is. The ideal would be a partnership of three. The State would look after the secular element, the body and mind; the home would look after the moral element, the training of character; and the Church would attend to the spiritual element, the culture of the soul. Si sic *omnes* . . . ! with emphasis on 'omnes.' In this partnership the State is the only one that pulls its full weight. The home is largely inoperative morally. And the Church, with all its resources and all its efforts, has failed to do its part with complete success, partly because in many cases it has not been allowed to do anything, thousands of children being entirely outside its influence, and partly owing to difficulties in the situation itself. It is a pity that the State cannot undertake the religious training of the young, but it cannot, or is not permitted to do so, and there's an end on't. Happily we are not a logical people, and we have managed, as usual, to hit on a compromise, and we have to make the best of that. I propose in what follows to look at this situation as it has developed in our own day, and perhaps the best way to arrange my thoughts will be to take the two terms in my title, and discuss their implications.

1. *Education.*—The first, and most obvious, thing to say in describing the present position is that large changes have been taking place in the conception of education itself. (1) For one thing, the older education might be called roughly transmissive. Its aim was to hand down the inheritance of the past. Authority and tradition played a large part in it. Of course, in the hands of good teachers education meant more. But it may be said, justly enough, that knowledge was the aim, knowledge of what had been found by past inquirers. I need not point out that there is a solid basis of justification for such a view of education, at least in part and on one side. But it is just as plain that the aim of education to-day is different. Education to-day is creative rather than transmissive. Its aim is wisdom rather than knowledge. Mere knowledge is barren. Its importance lies, as Dr. Whitehead says,[1] in our mastery of it, in what we do with it, in the extent to which it transforms immediate experience. If you have much to do with the young as they emerge from school and from the university, you soon note the dulled minds of those whose education has consisted in the acquirement of inert knowledge. . . . The craving for expansion, for activity, inherent in youth, is disgusted by a dry imposition of designed knowledge. Education is thus the training of the human spirit to function for life, the discipline of the powers so that they may possess the world and use the world for right ends. (2) Another contrast between the old and the new is that while education used to be material-centred, it is now child-centred. In other words, instead of planking down a mass of material which the child has somehow to absorb, we get inside the child's skin and inquire what is suitable for the child, what he can do, what is best for his development. This has a special bearing on religious education. The Bible is the material in question here. This was what had to be given to the child. Accordingly, we began at the first chapter of Genesis, and went on steadily to the end of the Acts of the Apostles, oblivious of the fact that much in the earlier parts of the Old Testament was quite unsuitable for a child of tender years, and indeed highly injurious to him; oblivious also of the fact that imperfect religious ideas might shadow all a child's youth and inflict untold harm. The late Dr. Jowett says that as a child he attended a Sunday school in which on the back wall of the building was painted a huge eye as a symbolic representation of God, and that well on into manhood this idea of God as a spy, cold and menacing, dominated his thinking. To-day we are learning better. We are giving up this tyranny of the material. We are constructing our religious syllabus, not on the chronological principle, but on a psychological basis. We rearrange the material to suit the child, and in accordance with truth, presenting first, and for years, *only* the person and teaching of Jesus. It is a pity we are not even more child-centred in our public schools, and that we do not realize the vital importance of moral and religious training at the secondary or adolescent stage, just when it is most needed, and when in many cases it is entirely absent.

The bearing of these contrasts on religious education is obvious. It will be still more so if we go on to consider, not general descriptions of the purpose of education, but actual definitions of it, which have become almost axiomatic and commonplace. One of these (and perhaps the best and truest) is that education is the development of personality. Everybody says that nowadays. It figures in almost any speech given on almost any occasion that deals with this matter. But think of the problem which this presents to the teacher. When he is told that education is the development of personality, he must ask himself, what is there in these children to develop? and what is fundamental in them? The answer to these questions determines for any teacher the whole lines of his work. Is there something Divine in the child? and is this the fundamental thing in him? Or is the child a merely secular and materialistic thing? Or, further, is he (as I was taught) a child of the Devil, with nothing good in him at all till that is implanted by the Spirit of God? You see how vital this issue is, as to whether the child is naturally a religious being, with something of God in him. Original sin is a fact, but is there not something more original than sin in human nature? If the answer is 'Yes,' then the teacher must realize that religious education is primary, that the religious element in education is basal, and that nothing that leaves this out can be called education at all. To train a child's mind and body, and neglect his soul, is to produce a monster. So far, if I am right, the relation of education and religion is perfectly clear and explicit, and it is one of the real advances in this sphere that teachers all over our own country, as well as elsewhere, are now coming to this worthy conclusion.

---

[1] *The Aims of Education*, by A. N. Whitehead, p. 49.

We come to very much the same conclusion if we think of education as the adaptation of a child to his environment. We have to ask here the same question: What is in the environment? Nature is a part of it. Society is a part of it. And (if we believe in God at all) the Unseen is a part of it. And for the child's adaptation to his surroundings religion is in every case essential. Nature means for a child the 'flesh.' It means that in part at any rate. And for the mastery of the flesh we need, not good resolutions, but an atmosphere. Professor Drummond used to say to us in our student days, 'Gentlemen, live on the top storey,' meaning that moral victory comes not from effort, but from the possession of life by a force greater than evil. This need not be elaborated. Look, again, at the social environment. What is to be the child's reaction to that? The ideal reaction is service, giving not getting. He is to be sent out into the world with the idea that his life is not to be spent for gain, but for that contribution to the world's good that is in him to give. And where is such a motive to come from but religion? In spite of all the political clap-trap to which we are sometimes treated, men are not naturally brothers. Far from it. Watch a dozen people getting on to a tram-car and you will be able to measure the *natural* brotherhood of man! It is only by the presentation of Jesus to children that they will learn something better. I need hardly add, except for completeness, that if there is an Unseen, in which lies the deepest secret for us men of victory, of peace, of salvation in the whole meaning of that wholesome word, then children must be 'adapted' to this. This part of the environment also must be the instrument of a real education. It is time, however, to go on and ask what we mean when we use the word 'religion.'

2. *Religion*.—I am discussing this point purely as it bears on the problem of education.

(1) And, first, I would say that religion does not mean *dogma*. I am far from depreciating dogma. In its true sense it is simply the intelligent and systematized explanation of experience. Science has its dogmas. Every intellectual pursuit has its dogmas. But dogma has no place in education. That is not how religion is to be communicated to children. Dogma is the end, not the beginning. And that is why religion cannot be taught from catechisms. It does not matter how true the statements may be to adult experience. Children have to grow into or up to them. Teaching by catechism belongs to a pre-scientific period of educational theory and practice. For one thing, children cannot understand the intellectualized statements of religious truth. And if it be said that they will understand them by and by, well, is there any other kind of truth that people would attempt to teach in that way? In that excellent Scottish play, *Bunty pulls the Strings*, the opening scene discloses a youth trying to learn the answer to 'What is Effectual Calling?' from the Shorter Catechism. He can't do it, and when his father comes in he says, plaintively, 'Faither, I canna understand it.' Upon which his dour parent 'glowers' at him and says, 'You werena *meant* to understand it.' And perhaps that may be left as a sufficient commentary on teaching religion by catechetical dogma.

(2) Nor must we mean the *Church* when we say 'religion.' Not any Church. By that I mean that religion, as it is to be given to children, should not be 'denominational.' It should not surely be anything narrowed or limited by the peculiar point of view of any religious body. A case can be made out for 'Church teaching' (*any* Church teaching), and a strong case. Any unprejudiced person must sympathize with the Church of England in its desire to give children 'positive' Christian instruction, and to provide an atmosphere in which such teaching may be effective. Such an atmosphere would make impossible what happened in a certain school where a teacher, after giving a Bible lesson, said to the children, 'At least that is what the ministers say, but I don't believe a word of it.' But surely this aim can be secured without any kind of Church supremacy. It has been secured in Scotland, where religious education is given in every school without any denominational tinge or bias whatever. I am glad to say that the use of the 'Shorter Catechism' is vanishing from the schools. But this catechism is in no sense denominational. There is not a word in it, so far as I remember, about any particular system of Church government, and its theology is just the theology of the Thirty-

nine Articles. There is no sectional element in the religious education given in the schools of Scotland. But there is definite, positive Christian teaching, given for the most part by teachers who are both convinced and devoted supporters of the primacy of this subject. The same is true of our training colleges for teachers, where Episcopalian, Baptist, and Presbyterian students are all trained together to give religious education, and that without any kind of difficulty.

(3) I hope I shall not be misunderstood if I say that religion does not mean the *Bible*. The Bible is the supreme instrument of religious education. But this statement has to be developed in two directions. In one direction it has to be expanded. We shall not have real religion taught if it is confined to the period for Bible instruction. The religious lesson ought to run through the whole school day. History, *e.g.*, can be taught in a religious spirit or in an unreligious spirit. It can be taught (without preaching) as the unfolding of the purpose of God throughout the ages. In the same way science, or 'Nature knowledge,' can be taught in a purely materialistic fashion, but it can be taught also in a fashion that will arouse and nourish that sense of wonder which is the parent of religion. And finally, the whole school life, and its organization and administration, can be made a genuine and fruitful instrument in the training of the youthful spirit. Something like this is what I mean when I say that religious education, in the hands of good teachers, is wider than Bible teaching.

But in addition to that, it must be insisted that Bible teaching does not mean, what it so frequently means in our day schools, merely instruction in Bible 'facts.' I do not know anything that needs more emphasis in this whole matter than the truth that teaching Bible narratives is not necessarily religious education at all. You may teach the history in the Bible and not leave any religious impression, or even any religious truth, in the child's mind. There is nothing necessarily more religious in the history of Israel than in the history of England. It is the truth behind and in the story that is religion. It is God, and God's will, and God's revealed purpose and dealings, in the story that is religion. And religious education is the communication of *that* to the child and the working of that into his conviction and his experience.

What, then, is religion, as it should be presented to children as part of their education for life? The simplest answer to that is: God's nature and will as these have been revealed in Jesus Christ. We find this in the Bible supremely, and especially in the Gospels. If I were to sum up the message of this revelation I would do it in four points: (1) The Fatherhood of God; (2) the Brotherhood of man, based on that Fatherhood, and on that alone; (3) the infinite value of each individual in God's estimation; and (4) the aim of life as service and not gain. These things have been revealed to us in and by Jesus Christ. And it would seem to me very essential that in all our religious teaching we should concentrate on the Person of Jesus and on what He taught by His life and words. The truths I have singled out as containing His great message have been those which have created our whole Christian outlook. The infinite value of the soul has been behind most of the great reforms in history (the liberation of the slaves and the emancipation of womanhood are two examples). The ideal of service instead of gain is the inspiration of true Christian citizenship. The brotherhood of man is the soul of a true internationalism and of the movement for peace on earth. And the Fatherhood of God, rightly stated and guarded, is the sum of all we believe and hope in our relations with God. Do we need more than this in our religious teaching? If a child leaves school with this religious equipment, is he not fitted to deal with life in a Christian fashion? Such a religion, of which Christ is the centre and guarantee and life, is a power, a joy, a consecration, as it ought to be. I know that for many people religion means more than this. For some it means the communication of the power of Christ's life through the Holy Supper. I am one of these. But is this part of the religion to be used as an instrument for training the spirits of our children? Possibly it is. If it could be taught without raising serious issues, one might agree. But whenever such a subject is mentioned the deepest differences at once appear. Again, for some earnest people the Church must have a dominant place in any religious conception they can entertain, and not only the Church but *their* Church. And here, again, just as deep and serious differences emerge. I am not suggesting that we should pare down religion until a thin and bloodless remnant is reached on which we would all agree. But I am suggesting that for the training of the souls of our young people, admittedly an urgent and clamant necessity, there is a definite, positive, great, and rich religious content in the presentation of Christ in His Divine fulness as we see Him in the Gospels, and that we should, and may, concentrate on this great instrument which God has put into our hands for the fulfilment of the greatest task to which any of us can devote his powers.

The Doctrine of Providence.

By the Reverend Norman Hook, M.A., Newbury, Berks.

The doctrine of Providence embraces two ideas which for the purposes of clearness may be distinguished. It stands primarily for the essential nearness of God, His availability and friendliness. But this availability and friendliness has always been associated with a teleological end usually expressed by the word 'ordering.' The Providential ordering of things refers to a good purpose which God has for the individual or the race.

This idea of a good Providence is an essential element of vital religion, and especially of Christianity no less than of its forbear Judaism. Indeed, it may be said of Judaism that the Providence of God was its most characteristic element and its most persistent attribute. There is no problem of miracle in the Old Testament, for in the absence of any conception of natural law, all phenomena are ascribed to God, and nothing is too wonderful for Him to do. Logically, such a notion as this could amount to nothing less than a thoroughgoing determinism, and it is interesting to notice how that time and again the relation of man's freewill to God's Providence provides an insuperable problem. If the hardening of a man's heart is the work of God, how can God righteously condemn him? Yet the freedom of man in the moral and spiritual sphere is insisted upon, and a solution of the enigma is supplied by the answer that the hardening of the heart is the penalty of sin. But if God is the potter and man is the clay (Jer 18^{6}), it is difficult to find room for any real freedom, and it is not surprising to find that the assumption of a moral order such as is implied by the idea of Providence is challenged as a contradiction to the facts of life. The author of the Book of Job accepts the assumption, but obviously he is in great difficulties over it. The writer of Ecclesiastes is frankly sceptical.

Broadly speaking, the Old Testament doctrine of Providence is concerned with the nation as moral unit, and up to this point it stands unchallenged. It is when individualism is born that doubts and difficulties arise. The burden of these difficulties was lightened by the late doctrine of an individual resurrection, but that the doctrine had lost much of its pristine power and appeal is shown by the existence of the Sadducees who 'felt no need of a divine Providence but relied entirely on their own resources' (*H.D.B.*, art. 'Sadducees.').

The contribution of Jesus lay in the new and attractive colours in which He painted the relations of Providence to the individual. Providence is beneficent to all men, good and bad alike (Mt 5^{45}). Nothing ever happens 'without your Father' (Mt 10^{29}). This is not a new doctrine of Providence, but a more attractive and a more individualistic application of it than is found in the Old Testament.

The intellectual difficulties of the problem reappear with St. Paul, who is content with the mere statement of them without attempting a rational synthesis. St. Paul sees a Divine purpose being surely worked out in the wide field of history (Ro 1^{3}). His conception of Providence in relation to the individual believer is very intense, and he sketches the course of it from the beginning in foreknowledge to the end in glorification. According to St. Paul, the law of Providence is 'that all things work together for good to them that love God' (Ro 8^{28}).

It is not proposed within the limits of this article to attempt to trace the fortunes of this doctrine throughout the ages. We must be content with a consideration of the present, which, as always, is very much a repetition of the past. The doctrine of the Divine Providence is still a real element of religion and is held alike by Catholic and Protestant. The difference is merely a matter of approach. To the Protestant, God's Providence is a direct and immediate experience to the individual. To the Catholic it is also and chiefly mediated through covenanted means. But to discerning eyes it is clear that the appeal of this doctrine, and especially its teleological significance, is not what it used to be. Something has happened, as a result of which we do not find it as easy as it used to be to speak of God's Providence. It is surely a significant fact that nowadays it is comparatively rare to hear a sermon on this subject, and much rarer still to hear a sermon which really grips the problem. What has happened? The answer is the new view of the universe which science has forced upon us, the implications of which are only beginning to dawn upon us. We are in a state of transition, and the symptoms are confusion in theological circles, empty churches in our midst, moral indeterminism, and an insensate craze for pleasure. If it be asked what vital difference has this new view of the world made, the answer is that it has destroyed the god of popular belief.[1] There are more than three conceptions of God—Catholic, Protestant, and Modernist. There is the god of popular sentiment who may be described as the parochial god of the village. To describe him thus is not to limit him to rural areas. He was born in rural areas before any towns existed, but he is still as strong in the towns almost, as in the country. This parochial god was a very real god, and his existence was intensely believed in. He was intimately concerned with the fortunes of his worshippers, so intimately, indeed, that his providence was as deterministic as anything in the Old Testament. He was concerned, for example, with birth and death. When a child was born to a family whose slender resources were already far too heavily strained, the responsibility was ascribed to his providence, and no doubt he would provide for it in his own good way. The outlook here is purely pre-scientific and detrimental in an unhealthy way to serious morality. It displays just that uncritical sentimentalism which is death to serious endeavour. Parents did not consider whether they could afford to educate and give a fair chance to the children they brought into the world: they were content to leave the matter to providence. No shame was felt for very large families where often the health of the mother was ruined and the children underfed. The outlook amounted to determinism, though, of course, it was not an intellectual determinism. The idea behind the birth of yet another child seemed to be that providence willed it, and that the parents were but the somewhat unwilling instruments towards this end. This was a comforting doctrine up to a point, no doubt, but it was fatal to the cause of true religion.

A similar notion was entertained with regard to death. Every man had his appointed time to die, and if that time had come, nothing could save him. A typical example of such determinism was the average Tommy in the trenches, whose courage was strengthened by the belief that if there was a bullet for him, no human or any other power could prevent it. His time had come and that was enough. A young man of the village, known to the writer, died recently. His death was sudden and tragic, and there was a great concourse of people at the funeral. They sang 'Thy will be done,' and they comforted themselves with the thought that, no doubt, in the providential ordering of things there was a good reason behind it all. But the naked truth of the matter was that this young man had led an exceedingly dissipated life, had contracted pneumonia, and his already weakened constitution was unable to resist the first onslaught of the attack. Here, again, the same sentimental determinism is apparent. No doubt the death of this young man was the will of God—in the sense that it was an object lesson of the working of God's natural laws, but the will of God in this sense is anything but a comforting thought. What these people lacked was any conception of natural law and of its relationship to God. It only required some great catastrophe such as would place an intolerable strain on the faith of the people, to destroy this parochial god of the village. Such a catastrophe happened in the last great war. People asked why did God allow it; and, because they could find no answer, this parochial god of the village is now almost dead. Almost, but not quite. Only the other day a man came to the writer and complained that he had been out of work for eleven months. The burden of his complaint was that he had prayed to God and could not understand why God could allow such a state of affairs to continue. He did not in the least see that in thus blaming God he was making God responsible for an economic impasse which most certainly has nothing to do with Him. But this parochial god of the village is on his death-bed, and his place has been taken by natural law. For all practical purposes the people are left without God: accordingly, they do not come gladly or regularly to public worship, they have ceased to read their Bibles, and they are vainly trying to seek happiness in pleasure.

But, maybe, this is too sweeping an indictment. It would be truer and fairer to state the situation as follows: there has been born a new idea, *i.e.* natural law; the people have not yet managed to see this idea in its true relationship to God, and meantime God is far removed and unconcerned. In other words, they have almost completely lost a grip of the idea of God's Providence. It would be untrue to say that the providence of the parochial god of the village always tended towards the selfishness and sentimentality which we have already noted. It had its fine phases as well. It could say at the death of a loved one—a life without blemish—that it was the will of God. God was very near in those moments, and His comfort was a very real thing. But now God seems far removed and very little concerned. The whole position may be summed up by pointing out that, whilst the new conception of the universe has delivered the popular religion of this country from an unwholesome sentimentality and an uncritical determinism—a combination which is destructive of morality—it has also robbed it of the warmth and comfort of the doctrine of the Divine Providence. The restoration of this, concomitant with a return to Christ's doctrine of God, is the vital need of our day.

---

[1] Untrue or imperfect conceptions of God are indicated by a small 'g.' So also *re* Providence.

Before we can decide whether this is possible, we shall need to get clear in our minds the relation of natural law to God.

1. We must see that the postulate of natural law is an axiom of a rational universe. A universe would not be a universe if it were not law-abiding. The universe as we know it is a cosmos not a chaos. One implication of such a universe is the existence of certain regions where God cannot rightly be expected to intervene in the manner of a *Deus ex machina*. Such a region, for example, is the sphere of meteorological conditions. To confess this does not in the least imply a dualism where natural law is set up alongside of God as some mysterious unknown power. By natural law we mean nothing more nor less than observed uniformities. The will of God is already expressed in this sphere, and to expect Him to interfere, such as prayers for the weather would seem to imply, is to ask Him to contradict Himself. This is not a matter of whether God is able to change the weather. It is a matter of reason and unconfused thinking on our part. God sends His rain on the just and unjust alike, not because He has no preferences, but because the condition of the weather at any given moment is the result of the way in which He Himself has constructed the universe. There is no reason why we should not believe that these principles of construction are not moral, inducing conditions which best further the purpose of God for the world. Indeed, this must follow if what we mean by natural law is an expression of the will of God. But to expect that such conditions would be moral for every single individual would be to expect the impossible, and not even God can do the impossible. To see natural law in its proper relationship to God is to be eased of much of the burden of its rigidity so far as the individual is concerned. It no longer becomes a problem which throws doubt on the Divine Providence.

2. If the postulate of natural law be accepted, we must assume some sort of Divine self-limitation. This will imply that there are circumstances in which even God is powerless to help, *e.g.* in certain stages of disease. If a man by his conduct in the past shuts the door of his life until recovery becomes an impossibility, then God is powerless to reopen the door of that life. Not even God can open and shut a door at the same time. There is a very considerable reluctance to make this admission in certain theological quarters, but surely it is merely the rational implication of the postulate of natural law. If the new conception of Providence is to mean anything real, then God must not be expected to do certain things which we have seen reason to believe ought not to be expected of Him.

3. We must beware of such an antithesis between natural and supernatural as will amount to a dualism. If in the case of a man who dies of, say, cancer, God is helpless, this does not mean that the operation of natural law as represented by the growth of the cancer (which is probably some infringement of natural law) is to be posited against God in a dualism of evil and good. All that is implied is that God is limited by the laws of His own universe, necessary *qua* universe. In such circumstances we may believe that God sympathizes with us and shares our grief—a much more rational and spiritual view of Providence than that implied by the older dualism.

If the net result of all this is a much more limited view of Providence, at all events we are left with a universe, rational in design, not capricious, truly a universe, and not without evidence that it is a splendid training-ground for the development of character. It is the contention of the writer that the conception of Providence can still be as real and fruitful a source of spiritual consolation as ever it was in time past. It is true that we are driven more and more to see Providence in the spheres of the mental and spiritual. It may be that these centres are the only true foci of a rational apprehension of the Divine Providence. At least it is significant to notice the growing belief in the spiritual as the heart of Reality, with the mental and physical as lower 'grades.' (See, *e.g.*, Temple, *Christus Veritas*.)

To assert thus the supremacy of the mental and spiritual is not to exclude the natural or physical, for all these spheres overlap and intermingle, the spiritual affecting the mental, and the mental affecting the physical. If we look for signs of the Providential in the physical, we shall expect it to be mediated through the mental. If, for example, a man cannot bring himself to believe, assuming the truth of what we have just contended, that the storm on Galilee's lake subsided at the word of Christ, it is open to him to contend that Galilee became calm in a no less wonderful way. Life takes its colour from our mental states. Galilee's lake was rough, no doubt, and exceedingly fearful were the hearts of the disciples. But supposing their minds had become perfectly calm during this storm, and supposing their souls had been freed of all fear of mortal peril, would they still have cried 'Lord, save, we perish'? If such a miracle of mind had taken place, would not Galilee's lake have lost its terrors? When there is calm within, the storm outside matters little. In other words, the power of God which comes from a firm realization of His Providence makes all the difference to the natural order because it makes all the difference to us. Such a conception of Providence implies, of course, the reality of man's freedom. It implies also that the notion of 'ordering' which we associate with the idea of Providence is conditioned by the response of the individual. God has a purpose for every man, but this purpose or ordering can only become actual in so far as man freely co-operates with it or gives it the opportunity of realization. Freedom is seen at every point where man opens out his life to God in trustful surrender; and the sequel of this is God's Providential ordering. Stated thus, the old problem of freewill *versus* determinism becomes unreal. In fact, it ceases to be a problem, for the purpose of God implies both. St. Paul could find no solution of the enigma because he had no postulate of natural law.

Arising out of all this, there is one further phase of the problem which requires examination. Can a purpose of God be discerned in the wide field of History? Is God responsible for the destiny of nations? And how far does such a thought, carried through to its logical conclusion, amount to an inescapable determinism? An unconditional affirmative in answer to these questions must undoubtedly amount to an absolute determinism. Our answer must be a conditional one. It is better to say that God's purpose is both general and individual at the same time. His purpose may be broadly defined as the salvation of souls, and a contribution to the fulfilment of His general purpose has been made whenever an individual soul directs its life along this the end for which it exists. As to how long this will continue, and as to whether God's purpose will ever be complete on this side of eternity, we are not called upon to say. But in speaking of God's purpose for the world we must perforce see it focussed in the individual, for this alone is consonant with freedom, and embraces that distinctive idea of ordering which we associate with the idea of Providence.

In the Study.

Virginibus Puerisque.

A Big Funnel.

By the Reverend John Paterson, B.D., Ph.D., Dumbarton.

'Strait is the gate, and narrow is the way, which leadeth unto life.'—Mt 7[14].

You all know how quickly a crowd will gather when there is anything to be seen. Some one runs and, somehow, all seem to follow. Some time ago I saw just such a crowd gathered on the bridge that spans the Leven, all looking intently over the bridge at something in the water. You won't guess what it was. It wasn't a man or a boy or a girl. It was a boat, or rather a barge, and it was carrying the queerest thing you ever saw. It was a steamboat's funnel, and a big funnel at that, and it was lying on its side as if it were having a rest before it was set upright on the big liner to do its lifework. Some one who knew all about funnels and ships told me you could drive a carriage and pair through it, so wide was it. It had been made in the engine shop above the bridge, and the liner for which it had been made was built at the mouth of the river, which is a good bit below the bridge, and if the funnel was to be set on the liner, you see, it had to pass through underneath the bridge. It seemed to tower so high even while it lay on its side, like a giant resting, that you would have said it was impossible for it to go through. It could not go through when we were looking at it, but there were men on the barge, and they knew when they would get through for they had studied the tides.

The funnel was waiting for the tide, and when the tide was at the right level in the early morning,—so early that nobody was there to see it go through—it passed down safely to the shipyard, and was hoisted up with a great big crane, and set on the liner, and that ship with that funnel is now sailing on the ocean. But the most wonderful thing about it all is just this, that when it passed underneath the bridge there were only three inches to spare. It wasn't much, but it was enough. The draughtsman who drew the plan, and the men who built what he had planned, knew that, and they said, 'It will be all right.' But it was a narrow thing!

Now I am sure Jesus never saw such a thing as a ship's funnel, but I think He saw at times something like all this. Perhaps He had seen a camel with its hump, maybe two humps, loaded with baggage trying to go through a narrow gate into the city. It simply couldn't be done until the baggage was removed and the camel stooped a little. He saw, too, many people eager to enter into 'the way which leadeth unto life.' Young and old came to Him, and said, 'What must I do to inherit eternal life?' Some came running, and Jesus did love those runners of the gospel story. But to them all He said just this, 'Strait is the gate, and narrow is the way, which leadeth unto life.'

At one time, a young man came running, and he was very keen to enter into the way of life. And when Jesus saw his keenness He loved him. But the young man had lots of money, so much, I think, that his pockets were bulging out, as yours sometimes are, although not with money! When he asked Jesus how he could get in, for he was very anxious to get in, Jesus just looked sad, and said, 'You can't go in with all that about you: strait is the gate, and narrow is the way.' You see, there's only room on it for two, Jesus and you; I don't think there are even three inches to spare here. The young man looked at Jesus, and then he looked at his bulging pockets—and he didn't go through. Jesus was sorry, very sorry, for He loved the young man, but the young man loved his money-bags more than he loved Jesus.

At another time an older man came: I think he was too old to run. Indeed, two came together, and they came to pray. They wanted to ask God about 'the way that leadeth to life.' One was a Pharisee, the other a publican. I think the Pharisee was a very big man; perhaps not as big as he thought, but the gate wasn't high enough for him to enter without bending, and he wouldn't bend! In the days of the Covenanters, about whom you will learn soon, there was one brave man, James Guthrie, who was known as 'the short man who would not bow.' He preferred to obey God rather than the King, for he believed the King was wrong. We might call the Pharisee 'the big man who would not bend.' And if you wish to know what I mean by that just look at the other, how he bends and throws himself on the ground, and cries, 'God be merciful to me a sinner.' When men bend and bow themselves thus, I think I hear Jesus saying, 'Come in, come in, eternal glory shalt thou win.'

There were only three inches to spare when the great funnel passed through. That was a strait and narrow way. But the gate through which we must pass to enter upon 'the way that leadeth to life' is even narrower. It's going to be a tight squeeze for all of us! It's certain we shall have to leave a lot behind, all our bad temper and our selfishness and our sin, for 'nought that defileth can ever enter in.'

The Mechanical Servant.

By the Reverend S. Greer, M.A., Ayr.

'The wisdom that is from above is . . . gentle.'—Ja 3^{17}.

Imagine calling up on the 'phone a man who was on board a liner in Mid-Atlantic, as somebody did the other day! But an even queerer thing is that you can telephone instructions to a new mechanically controlled servant which they have invented in U.S.A. He is shaped like a man, and walks about like a human being, and does the most wonderful things although he is only a creature of steel, and electric wires, and magnets. And he obeys his master's voice. When he is asked to, he turns on the lights, or will start the electric-sweeper, or switch on the radiator, and you can give him his instructions by telephone. 'Hello! Televox!' you say, 'put on the radiator, please; I'll be home in an hour.' What a nightmare figure he must look, champing and clanking about in a dark house, doing what he is told! Suppose he ran into you in the dark! Wouldn't it be weird to see doors opened by him at a word, and have a chair drawn up for you by this tireless, wageless servant, who never gives notice?

But, 'curiouser and curiouser' (and Alice never saw anything queerer in Wonderland), great care must be taken, we are told, to use just the right tone of voice when addressing Televox. For only particular sounds set the special tuning-forks in motion, to control certain actions, and he will respond only to words spoken in the proper tone.

How very human! Have you ever tried in how many different ways you can say 'Come here'? If there is a touch of domineering in it, when it is addressed to you, how your ruff goes up! Yet the words may be almost a caress. Everything depends on the proper tone of voice.

Have you heard of Teddy the little dancing-bear, and how he escaped from his owner one day in the city? Delighted with his freedom, he made off pell-mell down the street, round the corner, along a lane where he upset an apple-cart, into a shop and out again, leaving behind a hysterical girl who had frightened poor Teddy with a broom. It was great sport, and he was enjoying himself tremendously. Behind followed a crowd—policemen, busmen, messenger-boys, shouting wildly, throwing sticks and batons, until Teddy lost his head, and from being playful, he became excited and scared, and was about to attack a snarling dog, when, suddenly, he heard a voice—his master's voice. With a few caressing Italian words, his owner did what all the angry mob had not accomplished, and Teddy fell joyful and slobbering into his arms.

What was that about Televox? Oh yes! 'Great care must be taken to use just the right tone of voice.' Let us try it out on the people about us. 'The wisdom from above is gentle,' says the apostle. Some girls and boys think it rather 'soft' to be nice. Just try! The very next time you are going to answer angrily, or say unkind things, pull yourself up with a jerk, and you will find *what* a jerk it is. It isn't easy at all. Hot speech and hasty temper are not a sign of strength, though some fiery folk talk as if they were. Rather they are the marks of an ill-balanced nature, and nothing ill-balanced is strong. Nothing is so powerful as kindness, nothing so appealing as gentleness. One of the loveliest things said about Jesus in the Gospels is that 'He was full of grace.' How winsome His smile! When He said 'Come,' the boys and girls simply could not resist Him. Shall we then try to be followers of Him, and learn from Him that wisdom which is gentle?

The Christian Year.

Fifth Sunday after Easter.

The Divided Allegiance.

'So these nations feared the Lord, and served their graven images.'—2 K 17[41].

This is a somewhat remarkable statement. It looks extremely like a logical contradictory. The fearing of the Lord ought to exclude the possibility of the serving of graven images. Sometimes fortunately, and at other times unfortunately, as in this case, many things happen in life that do not happen in logic.

Certainly that was the case with the dwellers in the land of Samaria. What had happened was that the ten tribes of the Northern Kingdom had been scattered, to be lost for ever among the surrounding nations. In their place, a heterogeneous collection of different subject races had been sent by the Assyrian conqueror to cultivate the depopulated land. They brought with them, naturally enough, not only themselves but their gods. Where the name of Jehovah had been supreme, men cried unto Nergal, to Nibhaz, and to Tartak to save them. It so happened, however, that certain disasters fell upon the incoming colonists. There were literal lions in the way, that ate them. Immediately they assumed that there was something wrong with their worship. The theory of those days was that each territory had its own particular god, who not only governed the people, but possessed the actual land. These lion-terrorized aliens, basing themselves upon that theory, assumed that the god of the land was angry at neglect. Wherefore, they sent for some one to instruct them in the manner, that is to say, in the ceremonial modes, of worship of that god. But they did not neglect their own religious rites. So, thought they, they were safe.

How far away these dim guesses at God seem from us, and yet how near is the practice involved! Few verses of Scripture more aptly describe the weakness of our religious life to-day than this one, that we 'fear the Lord and serve other gods.'

What man of us, as he considers himself, but finds an ill-matched company within him? A half-allegiance to Christ consorts with a longing for excursions into territory where He cannot go with us; a niggardly worship of God is balanced by a following of the whispers of our own desires. God is there—a little; but with Him, and more potent over action than He, there is the god of pleasure and of ambition, the god of gold, and the great god of self.

1. In the first place, then, look at this curious fact of the divided allegiance. We all recognize, more or less, an unseen Power with whom we are in relation, and to a certain extent our actions are influenced by the thought of that Power. At the lowest, we are at the mercy of that motive, which, in a world so full of mystery as this is, never altogether leaves us, namely, the motive of fear arising from life's inevitable sufferings and from the unknown. We cannot help seeing sickness and death. Are the dead asleep, or do they live? If they live, in what strange God-lit land, beneath what eyes of living flame and purity, have they their being? As a man thinks he is stilled. And

even if it is in the very lowest room of religion, religious for the moment he is.

But yet, none of us is altogether free from that higher voice that speaks of our true rest in God alone. 'In every man there is a spark of God.' In every man there is a yearning for that life in union with which there is life indeed.

And these two types of experience have their effect upon us. At the lowest, occasionally we are frightened of God; at a higher level we fear Him; on a higher still, we desire Him. And each of these three emotions—fear, awe, and longing—so far affect our action.

At the same time, what one of us is altogether religious? The greatly sanctified are sore to seek. Even amongst honest, Christian folk, where shall we find the man whose every thought and word and deed springs from his union with God in Christ?

'Evil or good,' says Browning,

> may be better or worse
> In the human heart, but the mixture of each
> Is a marvel and a curse.

At the very best it is so poor. The thing is not done deliberately, of course; but the theory behind the practice is a kind of cautious, uncourageous insurance against all risks. In the meantime, there are the pleasures of Egypt. It would be a pity to miss them. After all, supposing this is the end of things, it is as well to get hold of present satisfactions. Wherefore, let there be a little sin, a little of the dazzling, delightful wrong of life. On the other hand there are queer possibilities. Wherefore, let there be a little restraint, a little worship, a little sacrifice, a charity here and there, so as to keep on the safe side of God. The fact is that, to those endeavouring to make the most of both worlds and to fashion their lives upon a scheme which is at once safe and mean, a dread word echoes from Him who knows, 'Ye *cannot* serve God and mammon!'

2. Now the type of man herein described is simply the semi-religious man. Two results can be set forth as following upon his practice.

He will be unhappy. The half-religious man is the most wretched being on earth. 'Without courage,' says Meredith, 'conscience is a sorry guest.' Browning indicates that whole-hearted devotion to a cause is the quality that God chiefly desires in man:

> pity, courage, hope,
> Fear, Sorrow, Joy, devotedness in short,
> Which I account the ultimate in man.

The terrible penalties of wretchedness, which life exacts from the half-hearted, support that view. Nothing is so certain a cause of misery as a divided allegiance. It secures the constant companionship of a shadow, with its darkness flung on every pleasure, its gloom upon every stolen moment of delight. Better be an old pagan, better sin a strong sin than thus attempt to placate God, while we yet offend Him.

Moreover, such a man will be uncertain and therefore ineffective. He will never know quite what to make of life. He will be unsure alike as to its object and as to his own desire; a man who lives in a circle instead of advancing upon a path. 'Oh, half-heart! a whole one though it be an erring . . . does at least live, and has a history and makes music; but the faint and uncertain is jarred in action, jarred in memory, ever behind the day and in the shadow of it.'

3. Now, what are men in such circumstances to do? Why, what these dwellers did—learn the manner of the god of the land; but also, what they did not do—learn that manner properly. We have to emphasize to ourselves afresh the severe exclusiveness of God's claim. The Lord God is still a jealous God. The earth is Mine: the hills are Mine and the sea: your souls are Mine, saith the Lord God. And, indeed, it is a just claim; not only because He claims us as Creator, but because He claims us with the claim of love. 'Ye are not your own; ye are bought with a price.'

So the old appeal comes back. We each of us know if we are in earnest about God. We know whether we desire Him to claim us all or not. We know where we can amend in our assent to His claim. There is no other way for us but the way of the great decision that we shall be His, body, soul, and spirit. And we have this to inspire us, that where there is honest desire to belong to God, proved by honest action, God comes in and takes possession. And who shall pluck that which is His out of His hand?[1]

Sunday after Ascension.

Our Picture of God.

'Thou canst not see my face: for man shall not see me and live.'—Ex 33^{20} (R.V.).

'He that hath seen me hath seen the Father.'—Jn 14^{9}.

The noblest idea that has ever entered into the human heart is the idea of God. And the most decisive factor within the soul of man and of civilization is a true and spiritual conception of God. The religion, the ideals, and, consequently, the character of a man, a nation, or an age can be understood only after one has learned in what light God has been viewed.

---

[1] J. R. P. Sclater, *The Enterprise of Life*, 36.

Our conception of God, however, is not the result of theological dialectic. Like all true knowledge, it is the result of experience—of man's gradual apprehension of the progressive revelation of the Divine. Visiting the Sorbonne in Paris, a traveller paused at the door of a lecture room. 'This,' said the guide, 'is the hall where the doctors of theology have disputed for four hundred years.' 'Indeed,' exclaimed the traveller, 'and pray, what have they settled?'

Theology is, indeed, the queen of sciences; but theology is not religion. It is no more religion than botany can be said to be flowers. Theology is but a telescopic lens which, if it be true to the best spiritual experience of the race, will assist men to see God. But if it be untrue to the best spiritual experience of the race, it will pervert men's view of God.

The idea of God, like all ideas, has had a long history. It is a far cry from the crude animism of our primitive ancestors to the Christian theism of to-day; or, to confine ourselves to the Biblical revelation, from the appearance of a God upon whose face no man can look and live, to the beneficent Being whom Jesus unveiled when He said: 'He that hath seen me hath seen the Father.' Nevertheless there is a vital thread of spiritual kinship running all the way, and if men are to-day seeing the Eternal One with a more clarified vision, it is simply because they are living in the revealing sunlight of the same day which their ancestors knew only in the early twilight. For countless ages man has been painting his picture of God. And the picture upon which he has been working is ever evolving into newer, truer, and more spiritual form and beauty.

Passing by those early forms of religious experience and practice common to all primitive races and to which, in spite of their crudities, all subsequent spiritual progress is related and indebted, we may pause for a few moments in the Old Testament Gallery. We ask: 'Is God great?' and the Psalmist shows us a God whose glory is revealed in the heavens and whose handiwork is written upon the firmament. We ask: 'Does God forgive the sinner after whom conscience, like quick-footed Nemesis, follows by day and by night?' And Isaiah portrays the world's Over-Soul as a forgiving Friend who pleads with men, saying: 'Come now, and let us reason together: though your sins be as scarlet, they shall be white as snow; though they be red like crimson, they shall be as wool.'

What if, with broken heart and hopes all crushed, we must dig a deep grave? What if, when no one can understand our loss, we must see some one die in whose stead we would willingly die a thousand deaths—what then? Does God care? Can He help? And lo! Moses—the austere father of Hebrew monotheism—unveils his portrait of God, 'The eternal God is thy dwelling-place, and underneath are the everlasting arms!'

But, after prophet and wise man had painted their best, came Jesus. The Hebrews had painted well. As a race, they were the religious geniuses of ancient times. And yet, in the best of the Old Testament portrayals of God, something vital is lacking. And it could not be otherwise. It was the finite seeking to express the infinite—the human attempting to depict the Divine.

Centuries ago, when the Riccardi Palace was erected in Florence, a room was set apart for a chapel, and Benozzo Gozzoli, a famous artist, adorned its walls and ceilings with beautiful frescoes. The artist was compelled to paint by the yellow light of a lamp, and through many years, by the same dim and flickering guide, worshippers strained their eyes to see the bright wings of angels and the roses of celestial gardens. At length the wall was pierced, the picture above the high altar was removed, and in its place the pure rays of the sun streamed in, revealing the varied and vivid colours and the beauty of line and shadow so long hidden.

Like the Florentine chapel, the Old Testament picture of God grew to be one of intense beauty. But, like the chapel also, the supreme beauty of God remained hidden from human gaze until the Sun of Righteousness arose in radiant and revealing light over the hills of the world and the Galilæan said: 'He that hath seen me hath seen the Father.'

'Jesus,' says Dr. Cairns, 'passed by the grand classical speech of religion, which was fast becoming a dead language, and took up the dialect of the human heart, and at this summons, and by the transfiguring power of His personality, the name of Father became pure and great enough to describe the inmost nature of the Eternal One.' Ah! Behold the Master Artist paint His portrait. God is a Father. He is a Father whose interests are bound up with the interests of His children; a Father who cares more for one human soul than for all the worlds that make their orderly pilgrimages across the awe-inspiring highways of immensity. He is a Father with a moral purpose; a Father who can, who cares, who wills—and who realizes His holy plans of redemptive love through the instrumentalities of history and of Nature. He is a Father who, considering our frame and remembering that we are dust, carries a blood-red cross upon His breast, and for our redemption mounts each day some new Calvary of pain and vicarious love!

Robert Browning, one of the greatest spiritual artists of the English-speaking world, describes the merciful nature of God when, in *Paracelsus*, he sings:

God! Thou art love! I build my faith on that.

. . . .

I know thee, who hast kept my path, and made
Light for me in the darkness, tempering sorrow
So that it reached me like a solemn joy;
It were too strange that I should doubt thy love.

But man did not, could not, fully comprehend until, upon Calvary's central Cross he saw God's eternal heartache—'the Lamb that was slain from the foundation of the world!' Then, and not till then, did man lift his voice and say:

O Cross that liftest up my head,
I dare not ask to fly from Thee:
I lay in dust life's glory dead,
And from the ground there blossoms red
Life that shall endless be.

And more, our picture of God is not static. It is in the process of becoming still more beautiful and understandable. Its perfection is not that of Rodin's 'Thinker,' but that of a living seed. The God who spake unto men of old time is speaking still—and speaking in a more universal language. There is much concerning God that we do not know. But of this we are certain: He is a God who is Christ-like, a God who is adventurous, a God who is tremendously in earnest![1]

WHITSUNDAY.

The Tie of the Spirit.

'If any man hath not the Spirit of Christ, he is none of his.'—Ro 8^9.

The text contains St. Paul's declaration that those who have not the Spirit of Christ are none of His. The truth here is in the language of the negative, and yet this is one of the biggest and broadest negatives in Scripture. Not far away in the background is a great positive, that the test of belonging to Christ and His kingdom is no formal tie, no mere statement of belief about Him, but a sharing in His very Spirit.

That is a great statement, and perhaps it is all the greater because it comes from a man whose mental demands made it necessary for him to state his faith in Christ in intellectual formulæ. St. Paul was one of those men with keen intellectual life, who, when they possess a faith, must state it in terms of the mind; but in so doing they do not reduce the faith to a series of dogmas. Behind and beyond the intellectual expression there is the spirit and the life. This distinction could hardly be made plainer than in the transparently clear words of this sentence, which tells us that the real dividing line in Christianity is drawn between those who have the Spirit of Christ and those who have not. This is the supreme test, which is none the less supreme because no way of human devising has ever been able to make the judgment simple and definite in the realm of practical affairs.

Now, if this be the real test of Christianity, it is also the present ground of agreement between the different sections into which it is divided. It is well sometimes to consider that the divisions of which we speak so much are upon the surface—divisions about government, about intellectual expression, about means and modes of worship. But is there any real division about the nature and fruit of religion in the soul? Do we differ at all about the Spirit of Christ when it is seen in the life of man? Not at all. The deeper we go the closer to each other we find ourselves. The true catholicism must find its basis, not upon uniform government or rites or creeds, but upon a common spirit which finds its way to the hearts of men and through them takes the throne of the world.

What, then, is the Spirit of Christ which is the spring of the Christian life?

We speak of men as having the Christian spirit or as revealing the Spirit of Christ. Have we any clear conception of the qualities involved in the name? Very frequently the title is used narrowly to describe the spirit of forgiveness, and tender sympathy with human frailty, and boundless charity, which the world continues to see in Jesus of Nazareth. But, though this may be true as far as it goes, it does not go far enough in description of the essentials of the Christian spirit. If the question were put to us directly, how should we describe the Spirit of Christ? How, for example, should we try to convey what it means to one who knows nothing of the Master's teaching and works?

---

[1] H. D. McKeehan, *The Patrimony of Life*, 68.

If we were ever faced with that situation, the first discovery we should make would be that words of description are poor and futile beside that shortest and greatest biography which has ever been written. The splendour which shines through the four booklets which we call the Gospels defies any attempt at reproduction or analysis. Art cannot convey it. Literature cannot exhaust it. Scientific analysis cannot explain it. Reduce it to propositions and you find that you have the skeleton of the life, but not the life itself. Like all the greatest things in the world, it will not be handled by cold touch; it eludes and escapes. Yet, elusive and mysterious as a breath, the life is reality itself. At the end of our efforts all that we can say is the old word, 'The Word was made flesh, and we have beheld his glory.'

But with the life itself to correct and complete the poverty of our descriptions, how shall we gain a clear idea of the Spirit of Christ? Not, I think, in the detailed teaching of Christ, nor even in His works, but, first and foremost, in His consciousness, and in His consciousness one truth which is like the sun lighting every planet in the sky, the Fatherhood of God. He came to bring us that consciousness, to reveal its meaning and its implications, and everything in the life of Jesus serves that aim. Look, for example, at the teaching.

Beginning with God as Father, the conception of man as a child of God leads to a new valuation of the individual life. Man is infinitely precious in the sight of God, his life has the stamp of the eternal upon it, and never, in spite of evil in the world and sin in the heart, can he drift beyond the Father's love and care. But man's new valuation leads to a higher appraisement of his task. He has a life to live in harmony with the will of God, a work to do larger than the boundaries of material gain. What is the dominant note in human duty, both in being and in doing, according to Jesus? Again, the Fatherhood of God inspires the answer —love. If God be Father, there is no room for that stunted caricature of Christianity, an individualistic religion. Man is bound to his fellows, and can only find either himself or God in fellowship. Love is the supreme note in the Christian ethic. Sins against love are gravest in its warnings. The service of mankind becomes, under Christ's interpretation, the most essential of religious exercises, and this because of the spring whence everything rises, the Fatherhood of God. How can you best worship and serve a Father? By helping His needy children. So it is that Christ's ideal of religion finds its expression not in an individual and lonely bliss, but comes to us again and again in that oft-repeated phrase 'the Kingdom of God.'

Even in the supreme mystery of Christian faith, the death of Jesus, the same connexion is apparent. How does a father deal with the sin of his children? Not by condemnation like a judge, but by sharing in and bearing the shame; and therein lies the human clue to the Cross. The whole story of word and work, life and death, is a connected one, and the foundation of all is the consciousness of God's Fatherhood. This is the Spirit of Christ. By it men are lifted out of self and sin into love and service.

This is the essential note of Christianity. All else fades into insignificance, and, beside it, disputes about modes of worship and statements of belief and validity and order seem incongruous. They seem to have little or no relation to the Spirit of Jesus. His Church consists of those who have caught a ray of His light and in whom His Spirit dwells. They have seen what He came to show, and life and work and hope become new creations. There is literally a new heaven and a new earth. What else matters or can matter? 'If any man has not the Spirit of Christ, he is none of his'; if a man has it, the means by which it has come can never be invalidated. It is this emphasis which is the crying need of the world to-day. We are moving towards a period of tremendous demand on the finest and strongest in human service. Where else shall we find the inspiration for it save in this consciousness of a Divine Will and Work for ourselves? We are more and more facing the great problems of man's relationship to man within the State, and of nation's relationship with nation in the world. Where is a guiding principle to be found save in the inevitable comradeship of men under the inspiration of God's Fatherhood? The need of the world is one vast cry for a fuller revealing of the Spirit of Jesus on a scale undreamed of hitherto. It is no call to the weaker elements in self, no message of ignoble safety or promise of favoured treatment. It is a call for strong men and women to live and work as makers of a new world.[1]

The Seed of Abraham.

TRINITY SUNDAY.

'But thou, Israel, art my servant, Jacob whom I have chosen, the seed of Abraham my friend.'—Is 41^8.

'Think not to say within yourselves, We have

---

[1] S. M. Berry, *The Crucible of Experience*, 33.

Abraham to our father: for I say unto you, that God is able of these stones to raise up children unto Abraham.'—Mt 3[9].

The juxtaposition of the two texts is no arbitrary one; each of these sentences illustrates a great underlying principle, a mode of thought suggested in the Old Testament and completed in the New.

In the passage from the Book of Isaiah is shown the greatest element in the Israelitish national consciousness. Apparently these people never forgot their vocation as the children of Abraham. Sometimes they attributed more importance to it, sometimes less. When the nation was at its best, they spiritualized the ideal; when it was at its worst they materialized it, but they never wholly ignored it. The Book of Isaiah is one of the richest parts of the Old Testament, and from the first sentence to the last this idea of the vocation of Israel is suggested or implied in it. In the chapter which precedes the one from which our text is taken the opening sentences are: 'Comfort ye, comfort ye my people, saith your God. Speak ye comfortably to Jerusalem, and cry unto her, that her warfare is accomplished, that her iniquity is pardoned.' It is as though he would say to Israel: 'You have passed through a severe testing time, but you have not ceased to be the people of God. Indeed, the testing time was permitted because you are never to be anything else than the chosen ones, God's Israel. You have Abraham for your father, and the covenant which God made with Abraham he will keep with you.' 'Fear thou not, for I am with thee; be not dismayed, for I am thy God.'

In the light of this Old Testament consciousness let us look at the passage from the New. Isaiah and John are both heralds; there is at least this similarity between them, that they both come as the bearers of good tidings concerning a better day. But they are different in this: while Isaiah speaks with the gorgeous magnificence of Oriental symbolism, and his message is one full of comfort and tenderness, the words of John are utterly unadorned; rugged and grim is the speech of this child of the desert. Yet, like Isaiah, he is the herald of a glorious day. He, too, is standing forth with the object of heartening his people and preparing them for the advent of One greater than he. But the people are not ready for his message, nor for the blessing which he announces. And so his words to them are words of warning, especially to the Pharisees. The people and their leaders had been inclined to content themselves with making much of the tradition of the covenant of God with Abraham, and they thought comparatively little of what was required from them in the keeping of it. The Pharisees were conspicuous for two particular vices. First, they trusted in their own righteousness and despised others. Their chief sin was that of spiritual pride; but another was, they believed in the externals of religion rather than in change of heart. They insisted much upon their lineage: we are the descendants of Abraham—will not God keep His word to him? What part or lot has the race of mankind in this, which is a special privilege of Israel? John's reply to them is: 'Think not to say within yourselves, We have Abraham to our father.' Why should God show His favour to men who are morally different from Abraham? God is able of these stones to raise up children unto Abraham.

What does John the Baptist mean by this saying? We believe that he meant exactly and literally what he said. What he meant, then, was something like this: It is in the power of God to breathe the breath of life into these rocks of the desert, that they should become living souls; and if so, it is conceivable they would be better men than you and worthier successors of Abraham, the friend of God. For who was, what was, this Abraham? If we turn to He 11 we read a Christian description of the man and his character: 'By faith Abraham, when he was called to go out into a place which he should after receive for an inheritance, obeyed; and he went out, not knowing whither he went. By faith he sojourned in the land of promise . . . for he looked for a city which hath foundations, whose builder and maker is God.' There are some good and devout Old Testament scholars who are inclined to question the historicity of Abraham, and to say that possibly he stands rather for a national idea, and symbol of the covenant between God and Israel, than that he was an actual historical character. We take a different view. It is possible that Israel did make of Abraham a symbol of the covenant between God and Israel, a grand idea, but there was a man to make the idea and the symbol possible. Cast your eye back along the line of history till its dawning morning is reached, and you will see sitting in a tent by himself on the borders of an eastern desert one like an Arab chief of the present day. Compared with ourselves this Abraham understood little about the meaning of life, little about the being of God; his was spiritual poverty indeed. Here is this Semitic nomad sitting thinking by himself: Is this the way to worship God? Must it always be by abomination, and cruelty, and lust?

Is it all for greed of gain? Is God a kind of devil who must be placated? Is this religion, is this worship, is this righteousness? And as he ponders he resolves: I must leave this society, and I will try whether I cannot live out what I am feeling now. Abraham saw a vision and heard a voice; and by faith he went out, trusting only that the voice which had spoken to him in his prayers was one with the hand that should guide him. Momentous results followed that far-off choice. It was the dawning of a great hour in which Israel was born, and with Israel the Messiah, and with the Messiah the gospel under which we live our lives to-day.

This, then, is the Abraham of whose seed these Pharisees claimed to be. They had not his moral courage, nor his noble spirit; these were not of the kind who would have gone out in pursuit of a spiritual ideal. These were men who had hardened into insensibility, who by their lives denied the spiritual idea Abraham had bequeathed to them, and therefore the Baptist's remonstrance was apt indeed: 'Think not to say, We have Abraham to our father.' As an illustration of what the fiery, indomitable prophet of the desert meant, we have the expression frequently upon our lips: 'His only recommendation is that he is his father's son.' Any worthless profligate who soils a noble name receives and deserves the reprobation of honest men. What you say about him is: This is no descendant of the noble dead; he has no right to bear the name. And this is what Jesus says to the indignant Jews who claimed Abraham as their father: 'If ye were Abraham's children, ye would do the works of Abraham.' All the great souls of history, God's called ones, God's men, can be put into the category in which Jesus stood when He spoke those words. They are not always recognized as such, but our moral consciousness recognizes where they ought to be. All the rest of mankind must find a different category. Did these Pharisaic time-servers, these bigoted Jews, who were questioning Jesus with the object of destroying Him, really think that they stood in the succession of him who was the friend of God? They did, but the consciousness of humanity since has put them right. We know now who are of the lineage of Abraham. An Anselm comes from the cloister to be Archbishop of Canterbury; he comes forth at the call of God. Reluctantly he turns his face away from that which had been his spiritual home, and takes up the duty thrust upon him by the importunity of a wicked king. The monarch and his aiders and abettors in wrong suppose that this weak man, this monk, whose business in life is to pray in a cloister, can be easily handled; they shall rule as they please in England, now that meekness sits on the throne of Augustine. But they reckoned wrongly; the strongest man on earth is the spiritual man. All alone, Anselm faced barbaric-materialistic England and vanquished it all alone. But yesterday, as it were, a William Tyndale, a George Wishart, a John Wycliffe, a Richard Baxter, taking not counsel with flesh and blood, came forth from what was, spiritually speaking, the house of their nativity, all alone, into an unknown and untried world, leaving comfort and preferment behind them; some of them to the martyr's death, all of them to suffering, ignominy, and shame. Do they need pity? By no means: these were of the seed of Abraham. And time would fail me to tell of others of whom the world is not worthy. Listen to Jesus again. He is addressing a company of His own countrymen. His mother and His brethren seek Him at the door, and cannot come at Him for the press. He does not repudiate them, but He enlarges the family circle. Looking round at the simple men who sat about Him, peasant fishermen of Galilee, He said, 'Behold, my mother and my brethren! For whosoever shall do the will of God, the same is my brother, and sister, and mother.' The true seed of Abraham are these.

Look at this old Abraham again for a moment. See him sitting thinking, weighing well the question what was to be done with his life, and let us recognize what is the very truth, that he had far less to guide him than we have. He heard the same voice as we do, but it had not told the world as much, then, as it has told it since. Yet Jesus says: 'Your father Abraham rejoiced to see my day, and he saw it, and was glad.' Abraham, in his lonely desert vigil, never saw Jesus; he had no foregleam of the day when Jesus should speak such words as these; but what he did have was the vision by which he saw the Sun of Righteousness arising in his own heart. That was Jesus' day. The Abraham who spent his early days in a guilty household, in the midst of men who never thought of the unworthiness of serving God by lascivious rites and brutal deeds, one day said to himself, 'This life has to be left behind.' So soon as he had seen that he had seen Jesus' day, and he rose up and went out to meet it. And that is just what we have to do.[1]

---

[1] R. J. Campbell, *The Song of Ages*, 185.

'The Cambridge Ancient History' and the Old Testament.

By the Reverend W. M. Mathieson, B.D., Broughty Ferry.

I.

The Old Testament Records.

Since the publication of vol. I. of the *Cambridge Ancient History*[1] in 1923, students of the ancient Middle East and the Mediterranean world have increasingly realized the value of this great enterprise which moves steadily on its way from the dawn of history towards a goal in A.D. 324, from which point the *Cambridge Medieval History* took its start. Under the editorship of Dr. S. A. Cook, Professor F. E. Adcock, and the late Professor J. B. Bury, successive volumes have presented us with accounts of the various movements, periods, and peoples from the pen of specialists in each national history and political or cultural phase. In the preface to the first edition of vol. I. the editors express the hope 'that the work will be found serviceable to professional students as well as to the general reader. The general reader is constantly kept in view throughout, and our aim is to steer a middle course between the opposite dangers, a work which only the expert could read or understand, and one so "popular" that serious students would rightly regard it with indifference.' There is no doubt whatever that the work is proving, and is destined further to prove, 'serviceable to professional students.' Whether that 'general reader' upon whom so many authors and editors of books of all sorts have hopefully or wistfully fixed their eyes will find in these volumes the literary fare he desires, or can easily assimilate, may perhaps be open to question. Our immediate point and conviction are that any serious student of the Old Testament will find in the volumes published to date a source of facts and of illumination which will enable him to see these ancient Scriptures in a true historical perspective and to view their contents in the light of scientific historical research. Here is a rich quarry for the writers of commentaries and for all who wish to give thorough study to the OT with a view to understanding its origins, its constituent documents, its narratives, its messages.

Now that the first six volumes of the *C.A.H.* have been published, we have the story brought down to *c.* 400 B.C. These volumes have been long enough in our hands for us to have surveyed at leisure and in detail the place which the OT holds in them. They cover precisely that period which the historical narratives of the OT themselves cover, if we date the work of Ezra *c.* 397 B.C., in the reign of Artaxerxes II. The OT contains a Jewish version of Ancient History, though brought very nearly up to date by that editor-compiler whom we call the 'Chronicler.' In the *C.A.H.* there are various references (*e.g.* I. 146, 222; II. 376; III. viii) to the fact that in the OT we have the earliest known piece of long and continuous history, tracing its story from the earliest times to the Persian age, with many tantalizing gaps, it is true, yet with a linking up of earlier and later conditions which gives it a 'pre-eminent historical value' (III. 416). How, then, does this Jewish Ancient History appear in those pages of the *C.A.H.* which cover the same period and which utilize the OT as one of the historical sources?

How the OT will appear in any connexion depends largely upon the person who presents it to us in that particular relation. The chapters in the *C.A.H.* which may be called its OT sections are from the hand of Dr. S. A. Cook, though in I. 130–134 Professor R. A. S. Macalister has some pages on Syria and Palestine in his chapter on 'Exploration and Excavation,' while the same writer in III. 333–353 deals with 'The Topography of Jerusalem.' Dr. Cook in vols. I., II., III., and VI., from point to point in the long story of that ancient world, treats of the regions of Syria and Palestine, and of the striking and distinctive rôle played by the Israelite people. It is not to be thought, however, that it is only from Dr. Cook's chapters that the OT student will get enlightenment. The whole work has a bearing, now direct, now indirect, on the history of a people who were inextricably linked with the surrounding nations and influenced by movements from Egypt, Mesopotamia, Asia Minor, and the Ægean, regions whose history and culture receive full and often fascinating treatment. Written, however, by a single pen, the sections which are specially relevant to, and which make special use of, the OT have a kind of personal coherence and present a unified view of the Scriptural documents as historical sources. This was probably the best plan that could have been followed, although at times one may feel that it is scarcely in harmony with the aim expressed in the preface to vol. II. (p. vi), 'the Editors have deliberately refrained from the effort to make the work represent any one particular school or tendency.' But while Dr. Cook does represent a particular school of OT study, and inevitably looks at his material from the point of view which that school has come to adopt, he is too conscientious and careful a scholar to give misleading ideas as to the evidence available and the conclusions which may be drawn from it by any one who does not feel constrained to accept his conclusions. His statements, on the whole, are models of caution; so much so that his qualifications and reservations often make him rather difficult to read for one who will not take the pains and give the time necessary for the apprehension of his balanced and condensed utterances. The discerning reader may well be filled with admiration and amazement at the amount of detailed and carefully weighed knowledge that lies behind Dr. Cook's chapters, which, the present writer computes, comprise in vols. I., II., III. and VI. some three hundred and seventy-five pages of compressed exposition, in addition to twenty-seven pages of bibliography, much of it fully annotated. One is glad that here and there Dr. Cook utilizes the space available at the end of a chapter to give himself the luxury of a few footnotes in which he more explicitly indicates and summarizes his own particular point of view on certain questions.

---

[1] Referred to throughout the remainder of this article as *C.A.H.*, and quoted by number of volume (I., II., etc.) and page.

How, then, does the OT emerge as an historical source from its scrutiny and utilization by the modern scientific writer of history? There are two questions here which, while closely related to one another, may for the sake of clearness be distinguished: (1) What are the characteristics of the OT records as sources for history, and (2) What is the view of the OT history which results from a critical examination of these records and a full use of the available external evidence?

The first of these questions will occupy us in the remainder of this article. It will be noted that by 'The OT Records' in this connexion we mean those writings or portions of writings which are of a predominantly narrative character and which profess to set before us historical facts and processes. Moreover, we are not dealing with their character as 'inspired' writings, nor with their function as conveying a Divine 'revelation,' though any attempt to form theories of inspiration and revelation will have to reckon with, and be adjusted to, the results of the kind of inquiry we have in view. We are simply noting how these ancient Scriptures appear when appraised and utilized by the trained historical expert in such a work as the *C.A.H.*

I. We may first of all consider a wide group of characteristics of the OT records which we see the historian being forced to reckon with as he seeks to use these writings for his purpose of narrating accurately the course of bygone events. He is faced with the fact that he is dealing with writings which the people among whom they originated, when they set about selecting, arranging, classifying, and giving them a definite status, did not evidently consider to be history pure and simple: that was neither their original character nor the reason for which they were preserved and valued. Some of these writings (Genesis to Deuteronomy) were grouped as *Torah* ('instruction'); some (Joshua, Judges, Samuel, Kings) were entitled *The Former Prophets* ('preachers' is perhaps as near as we can get to a paraphrase); some (Chronicles-Ezra-Nehemiah) were classified as *Writings* along with books of a distinctly didactic and hortatory and reflective character. This gives the historian pause at the outset, even before he subjects these writings to minute examination.

The results of such further examination may be sufficiently indicated by two quotations which Dr. Cook makes from earlier pioneer workers, whose method and spirit are reproduced, in a broad sense, in his own pages, though his treatment of the sources is less purely 'literary' than that of the students referred to. The first of these quotations (VI. 167) is to the effect that 'the Mosaic history is not the starting-point for the history of ancient Israel, but for the history of Judaism.' These words of Wellhausen may be called the thesis of his *History of Israel* (1878). The second quotation (II. 352) is from W. Robertson Smith's Preface to Wellhausen's *Prolegomena to the History of Israel* (1885): 'the OT does not furnish a history of Israel, though it supplies the materials from which such a history can be constructed.' The reader of the *C.A.H.* will find that Dr. Cook considers Robertson Smith's dictum much too optimistic, and that from time to time he states that the materials afforded by the OT are entirely inadequate for the construction of a history of Israel. Such remarks as the following on one period are typical of many on other periods: 'The problem of the rise of Israel has yet to be solved' (II. 382), and 'our sources are too imperfect for any consecutive and detailed account of the history' (II. 406, footnote).

Wherein lies this imperfection or inadequacy of the OT records for the historian's purpose? Partly, of course, in their scanty quantity: they are very brief for the presentation of so many centuries of crowded history. But chiefly the difficulty lies in their general nature and their detailed characteristics as not truly historical documents. We have already noted that they have as a whole a didactic aim—religio-didactic and ethico-didactic. This didacticism is not merely in the shape of comment added to otherwise straightforward narratives. There is such comment in some of the sources; but the didactic element is much more profoundly and subtly present. It is worked into the very warp and woof of the stories, where what we might call the 'lesson' is not expressed, but is implicit in the presentation of the course of events. While this procedure has its own special spiritual value, and its own particular kind of truth, it complicates the task of the pure historian in getting at sequences of cause and effect in the political and social region. In his long and valuable chapter on 'The Semites' (I., chap. v.), Dr. Cook has a section on the Semitic 'Treatment of History' (pp. 217–225) in which various points of view are presented, enabling us to put the OT records in their original antique and specifically Semitic setting. Towards the close of the section we meet with the following: 'Our whole conception of world-history, as derived ultimately from the Bible, is Semitic, the product of the religious consciousness and the result of religious reflection. Modern views of origins and of early development are replacing the wisdom of the ancients, but the religious and philosophic interpretation of the new facts does not lie within the province of the historian' (p. 225). While one may demur to the point of view of the last words and believe that history can never be truly written without an element of spiritual interpretation, the quotation sums up our present position that the OT records are didactic as containing a particularly strong and characteristic element of religious reflection and instruction.

A further quotation from the same chapter (p. 225) will bring us to another point by indicating a way in which the historical student at once discounts and uses the OT documents. 'The Biblical narratives, in Genesis as so frequently elsewhere, are of chief importance for the light they throw upon what was thought of the past. In this way they illumine the inner history of very much later times, when the development of thought in these lands can be more fully traced. The early chapters of Genesis, which purport to be the history of the world before Abraham, thus prove to be of real and permanent value for our knowledge of subsequent periods, to which they are a far more important contribution than ever they could be for pre-Abrahamic or pre-Mosaic history.' The mentality and outlook of a later writer are revealed in his presentation of the past, giving a clue to points of view, and even to events, in his own day. Further, the writer often throws back into the past customs and institutions which belong to his own age. He sometimes does so unconsciously. He sometimes does so as seeking to give those customs or institutions the status and authority of that which has been long established or is connected with famous names in the past. Moreover, it is sometimes sought to explain, and account for the genesis of, ceremonies or ideas by showing them originating in certain circumstances of the past for which it is difficult to see how the writer could have any satisfactory evidence. So, too, ætiological stories and popular etymologies came to assume the guise of matter-of-fact narratives and to be accepted by later authors or compilers as valid means of accounting historically for things in their own surroundings. Very many instances of how the historian has to reckon with this reflection of the present back into the past will be found in the pages of the *C.A.H.* As a single example—one which is by no means the most cogent and which may be surprising to some readers—there may be adduced the point of view that some things said about Solomon's dominions and period are to be explained from the extent and organization of the Persian satrapy of 'Transpotamia.' 'It is probable that other conditions of the Persian age are reflected in the late accounts of the first great kings of Israel and Judah' (VI. 176, footnote 3).

The writings which we find in the OT not only display a certain amount of the foregoing 'reflection' of conditions of one age back into another; they also display what may be called, in a general way, 'tendency.' Such tendency may be of various kinds. We sometimes meet it as the tendency to glorify a particular institution. Events are emphasized and so presented as to lead up to the Divine purpose in connexion with, and to the national importance of, the institution in question. This may be seen in reference to narratives leading up to the founding of the Jerusalem temple and the important place of the priesthood in connexion with it (*e.g.* II. 383 f.—'Our sources . . . appear to reveal the traces of particular monarchical and priestly tendencies, such as meet us in full force centuries later, when these narratives were receiving their present shape'). Again, the tendency may be that of a particular theory held by a compiler, or more probably by a school of thought to which he belongs. Much of the material which the OT provides for the historian is rendered less tractable for his purposes by being the vehicle of some theory as to development, causes, origin, or the like (*e.g.* III. 415, footnote—'the historical narratives give expression to certain definite theories'). There is also to be noted that turn or bias given to a narrative by a writer or editor who, probably in common with his age or class, cherishes some antipathy. He views the past as one who has an animus, born of temperament or some bitter experience, against some of the actors in it (*e.g.* III. 405—'A noteworthy feature of the Biblical sources is the obvious antipathy both to the native population of Judah [who had not been in exile] and more especially to the Samaritans'). Apart from the distorted view which antipathy may give, there is the result of limited outlook and interest. Great stretches of OT story exhibit a certain narrowness and lack of proportion arising from the fact that the writers are mainly concerned with the fortunes and prestige of Judah as distinct from the whole body of the Israelite tribes and from the northern kingdom in particular. One of Dr. Cook's favourite expressions is 'through Judæan spectacles' (*e.g.* III. 414), and he constantly warns the reader of the OT that these spectacles are often the medium, and a distorting medium, through which he is looking at events.

The fact that in what has been so far said we have often spoken of editor or compiler rather than author points to a characteristic of the OT records which we may note in concluding this section. These records are the result of compilation. In making their compilations the writers often had to choose between different traditions or varying forms of the same tradition. They thus pursued a selective process in many cases, and their selection may have been injudicious. They exercised 'criticism' upon their available material; and their 'criticism,' from such causes as we have noticed above or others, may have been faulty and ill-founded. Thus the present-day critic often has to seek to undo the work of the ancient critic. But instead of selecting, the compiler sometimes combined; and by so doing, while he gave the modern student ampler material, he posed him with very difficult and often quite baffling problems of preference and co-ordination and discrimination. Conflicting traditions were set down side by side or very imperfectly harmonized. Thus we find that at many points Dr. Cook, while feeling an understanding sympathy for the old historians themselves (of the Davidic era —they 'had at their command only incomplete material and incompatible traditions,' II. 397), is forced as a present-day historian, seeking to use the material that his Biblical predecessors have bequeathed to him, to make such a confession as 'when we turn to the traditions of David the difficulty of reconciling the various accounts of this age become insuperable' (II. 391). But the critical historian must persevere at his task and use all the resources of modern scholarship in order to try to get at the facts and processes of history which are at the back of the compilations which the OT writers have left him. 'It is precisely on account of the combination in the OT of different sorts and centres of interest, types of thought and perspectives of religious and political history, that the Israelites' own account of the past has to be replaced by the attempt to recover the historical events that lie behind it' (I. 223).

II. To assist him in recovering the historical events that lie behind the OT writings and in dealing with these as materials for history while rejecting them as history ready-made, the student seeks to utilize whatever 'external' evidence may be available. As a further means of viewing the Scriptural records in the *C.A.H.*, we may now consider the use made of external records. This will let us see how the OT compares with the external evidence, in what respects it is inferior to this, how the two sets of sources may be used in combination, and whether combination is sometimes simply impossible. Our chief aim still is to find out what the scientific historian makes of the Biblical narratives when he uses them in conjunction with narratives, or other evidence, derived from quarters independent of and quite uninfluenced by the standpoints of the OT writers.

In the *C.A.H.* the reader specially interested in the OT will find an attempt made to put him in full possession of the information relevant to Biblical events which can be obtained from external sources. He will find such evidence dealt with in the history of those regions from which it comes—Babylonia, Egypt, Assyria, the lands of Hatti and Mitanni. He will also find this evidence adduced by Dr. Cook at the proper stage in his story of Israel, together with the similar evidence which comes from the Syrian-Palestinian region itself. The accumulation of fresh evidence, especially of an archæological kind, has been great in the last few years: ancient Sumerian sites and Palestinian 'tells' have been yielding their secrets. The result is that the first two volumes in particular (I., 2nd ed., 1924; II. 1924, reprinted with corrections, 1926) are not quite up to date at some points. But the student who uses these volumes has an elaborate corpus into which he can fit each fresh piece of information which comes to light.

Dr. Cook, then, makes full use of every kind of external evidence to illuminate the OT records. But it is his principle at every period of the history that monuments, tablets, papyri, archæological discoveries of whatever nature, are not to be used simply to illustrate, or make some little addition to, the story of the Biblical sources. These latter do not provide a story which the student will seek to 'confirm' by external evidence, showing little interest in the latter when it does not serve this purpose. The external evidence will not be tested and valued by its conformity with the Biblical presentation of events. The opposite must be the case, in view of the character of the OT records outlined above. The external evidence (carefully scrutinized, of course, and its character appraised) provides the framework into which the Biblical events have to be fitted and by which the Biblical evidence has to be judged. Of course, the amount of external evidence at present available is by no means sufficient to discharge this function adequately and in any kind of continuous detail for the period with which we are concerned, say 2000–400 B.C. But in considerable fullness at some points (*e.g.* the 'Amarna' age, early fourteenth century B.C.; and the period of the great Assyrian advance westwards, ninth and following centuries B.C.), and in a more sporadic and fragmentary fashion at many other points, the external evidence provides the Biblical student with controls and correctives.

But why should the external evidence be thus accepted as authoritative? How is it in any sense conclusive as against what the Biblical writers may have to tell? The chief answer to this question is to be found in the *contemporary* character of this evidence (whether articles from excavations, or 'documents' from archives, or records on monuments and temple structures) as contrasted with the preponderantly non-contemporary character of the OT historical narratives in their present form. Just as the prophetical writings in this respect of contemporaneity sometimes furnish excellent historical material, so the historian seeks from external sources evidence of a date practically coincident with the event celebrated or referred to. Naturally the external evidence cannot always be accepted quite at its face value. Like the Biblical narratives it may sometimes display 'tendency' in the manner of glorification or exaggeration. We need not, for example, take as wholly corresponding to fact the crushing character of the defeat which Shalmaneser III. claims to have inflicted on the Syrian coalition (including Aḫabbu Sir-i-lai, *i.e.* Ahab the Israelite) at Ḳarḳar in 853 B.C. Yet here is an instance where an Assyrian record not only gives us illuminating contemporary evidence, but furnishes a definite date which can be used to construct a chronology for Israelite history, working backwards and forwards from it. The value of such evidence, with its recognized limitations, may be put simply in a sentence of Dr. D. G. Hogarth's (II. 256), from his chapter on 'The Hittites of Asia Minor,' dealing with what is 'external' evidence for an early period of Hittite history: 'The Assyrian records in question are in the main contemporary with the events they record, and, therefore, subject to discount on grounds only of *ex parte* tenor or obscurity.' As an example of the historian's taking into account *ex parte* tenor, and peering into corners of obscurity, yet using to fruitful ends a wealth of the kind of evidence we are referring to, there may be cited Dr. Cook's long chapter (II. 296–351), 'Syria and Palestine in the Light of External Evidence.' This is a picture of the 'Amarna' age in Syria and Palestine, and an exposition of the governmental, political, racial, and religious factors to be seen at work in that early fourteenth-century era. It is a *tour de force* of historical reconstruction. Yet, on the other hand, the flood of new light thus shed on a period of international relationships and cosmopolitan interests leaves us puzzled by the evidence, or lack of evidence, which the Biblical writers provide for periods which must be supposed to adjoin or coincide with that same epoch.

Such are the difficulties which the historian has to face when using the OT records and seeking to co-ordinate these with records of another kind and from other quarters. There are those (and the present writer is one of them) who may feel that in the *C.A.H.* Dr. Cook has shown himself hypersceptical at some points as to the amount and nature of the information which the Biblical narratives can yield. But it is well that these narratives should thus receive searching and, in a scientific sense, merciless treatment. For this is part of the process by which we shall arrive at their true value and character, historically and spiritually. Timidity in dealing with them is not true reverence towards them. It is a falsely-motived instance of 'trembling for the Ark of God.' It is honouring neither to the Scriptures nor to man's conscience and intellect. The reverence which they will deserve and will receive from the student of history must come as the issue of painstaking and exacting and many-sided study. Some of the fruits of that study which the volumes of the *C.A.H.* afford us in the matter of portraying Israelite history will be the subject of another article.

The Exodus of Jesus (Lk. ix. 28-31).[1]

By the Reverend F. V. Pratt, M.A., Marrickville, N.S.W.

I. I do not propose to attempt to psychologize or to explain away the exquisite story of the Transfiguration of Jesus. There are more things in heaven and earth than are dreamt of in our philosophy. My own conviction is that in this matter we have in the Gospels a substantially correct account of what really occurred. Our Lord was praying, at night, on mighty snow-capped Mount Hermon. As

> Cold mountains and the midnight air
> Witnessed the fervour of His prayer

His body underwent an extraordinary change. It became illumined, brilliant, dazzlingly white. Visitors from the Unseen World appeared. They were Moses, the representative of the Law, and Elijah, the representative of Prophecy. They talked with Jesus on a subject of stupendous importance, the decease, the departure, the *exodus* which He was about to accomplish at Jerusalem.

II. Let us observe that His death, about which He had recently spoken in the words, 'The Son of man must suffer many things, and be rejected of the elders and chief priests and scribes, and be killed, and the third day be raised up' (Lk 9^{22}), is here spoken of not only as an exodus, but as an *act*, a fulfilment, an accomplishment. The subject of conversation was the decease which He was about *to accomplish* at Jerusalem. That is to say, the Death of Jesus was not only a Passion, a Suffering—we are perhaps too much obsessed with that view of it—it was a deed, an act, an accomplishment. It was not only the suffering of a martyr sealing with His blood His message of the Fatherly love and care of God and of the brotherhood of men of every status and race and colour: it was that, but it was also the heroic act of a redeemer, of a deliverer, of one destined to do for the whole race of man, all and far more than all that Moses, the leader of the historic Exodus from Egyptian bondage, did for the children of Israel.

III. It was a *voluntary* act. The Good Shepherd voluntarily laid down His life for the sheep. Remember the saying in the Fourth Gospel, which I doubt not gives, at least, the Master's thought if not His actual words: 'Therefore doth the Father love me, because I lay down my life, that I may take it again. No one taketh it away from me, but I lay it down of myself. I have power to lay it down, and I have power to take it again. This commandment received I from my Father' (Jn 10$^{17. 18}$). It was a commandment indeed, but a commandment willingly, voluntarily obeyed. 'I delight to do thy will, O my God' (Ps 40^{8}). 'I have power to lay down my life, and I have power to take it again.' There is something here mysterious, solitary, unique, supreme, Divine. Not thus spake Socrates as he put the poison cup to his lips, though he did it with wonderful calmness, cheerfulness, and courage; not thus spake any of the noble army of Christian martyrs, triumphant though their passing may have been. Which of them could or would say: 'I have power to lay down my life, and I have power to take it again'? They possessed no such power, and they knew it. Thus speaks the Lord and Master of life, and the Lord and Master of life alone.

IV. It was a *Divine* act. '*God* was in Christ, reconciling the world unto himself' (2 Co 5^{19}). Let us observe that the true Christian formula is not God *and* Christ, or God *or* Christ, but God *in* Christ, God coming in Christ, seeking in Christ, reconciling in Christ, saving in Christ. God in Christ *reconciling*. Note, I beseech you, that the verb is in the *active*, not in the *passive*, voice. It is God in Christ reconciling, not being reconciled. Let us cleanse our hearts and minds of the fundamental heresy, all the more deadly because it masquerades as orthodoxy, that the Lord Jesus Christ by His death, His decease, His exodus, which He accomplished at Jerusalem, reconciled, appeased, propitiated His Father and ours, as if He were a gigantic Shylock who would not pardon His children, no matter how penitent, until He had had his 'pound of flesh' (in the blood of His dear Son). This parody of the Atonement is hideous, pagan, God-dishonouring, and is, I am persuaded, responsible for countless multitudes of unbelievers and scoffers. The death of Christ does not mean Christ reconciling God, but God in Christ reconciling us. According to the Apostle Paul in Ro 5^{11}, it is not God, but we, who receive the atonement. It is perhaps worth noticing, in passing, that this is the only place in which the word atonement occurs in the 1611 version of the New Testament. In the 1881 Revised Version it does not occur at all, reconciliation being substituted for atonement, and the text reading, 'We rejoice in God through our Lord Jesus Christ, through whom we have now received the reconciliation.' Let us try simply to illustrate. Two friends have quarrelled. The guilty one, conscious of his guilt, fears even to attempt to restore the old relationship, lest he should be indignantly spurned. But the one sinned against longs for reconciliation, for the restoration of the old comradeship. And so he awaits his opportunity. Then at a convenient season, Christmas or a birthday, he sends his estranged friend a gift, writes a letter, gives some token, which indicates that on his side no barrier to reconciliation exists. God so loved and longed for the world, guilty, foolish, misunderstanding, wandering, that He gave His love-gift, His best, His only-begotten Son, so that in Him whosoever will may return to the Father's heart and the Father's home.

---

[1] An address given at a Student Service at Leigh College, Sydney, N.S.W., 18th April 1929.

V. It was a *redeeming*, delivering, liberating act. Let us think of the suggestion of the word *exodus*, 'his exodus which he was about to accomplish at Jerusalem.' Our thoughts turn naturally to the historic Exodus, when Moses, no slave himself, but a prince, 'the son of Pharaoh's daughter' (He 11^{24}), led his enslaved brethren out of the dreadful bondage of Egypt. So Jesus, 'Our Prince Leader in the faith' (He 12^{2}, Weymouth), leads His people out of a bondage more terrible by far than the bondage of the Israelites in Egypt. What bondage is this? The bondage of sin, the Egypt of self, what Paul calls the flesh, the lower, self-centred, self-regarding, earthward-looking nature. Self is the Egypt from which we sorely need redemption, deliverance, liberation. Paul suggests this in a great saying, which rewards careful analysis. To the Corinthians he writes: 'Ye are not your own; for ye were bought with a price' (1 Co $6^{19.20}$). Bought from whom? The old master, of course. Who was he? Not the devil, as Irenæus, Origen, Gregory of Nyssa, and others supposed. The Apostle does not say, 'Ye are not the devil's, for ye were bought with a price.' What he does say is, 'Ye are not *your own*, for ye were bought with a price.' The old master then is self, the old proud, greedy, tyrannous self, who indeed is 'the very devil,' so perhaps Origen was not so far wrong after all. 'Ye are not *your own*,' says the Apostle. You used to be. Self was the old Master, and a pretty tyrant he was. Matheson says, in his great work on the Book of Revelation, that the number of the Beast is number one. But now you have been redeemed, delivered, released, liberated, set free from that worse than Egyptian bondage. How? Through Christ Jesus. When He gives Himself to the receptive, welcoming heart, we receive His spirit, His life, His very blood; so to speak, that blood which, as S. Ignatius said, is eternal love. Then we undergo a progressive, inner, spiritual transfiguration. We are redeemed from the Egyptian bondage of self. 'The law,' the principle, the power 'of the spirit of life in Christ Jesus makes us free,' liberates, redeems, delivers us, 'from the law,' the principle, the power, 'of sin and of death' (Ro 8^{2}).

Recent Foreign Theology.

Maria.

Professor Wobbermin is one of the most instructive writers in modern theology, uniting, as he does, clear vigour of thought with an almost unfailing lucidity of expression. His eminence in his own country has recently been acknowledged by the publication of a special number of the famous *Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche*, composed of essays written in his honour. More than one of these dwells upon the religio-psychological standpoint for which Wobbermin has impressively contended now for many years, and which has gathered keen adherents.

This new work,[1] though short, is a valuable guide for those who wish for orientation in the present-day field of Dogmatics. It is directed against the Historism and Psychologism (to use terms we may not love, but can hardly dispense with) which, rightly or wrongly, have been charged upon Troeltsch, as well as against Karl Barth's treatment of the problems these terms represent. A subjective psychologism in theology, though certain expressions may be doubtful, was not really taught by Schleiermacher, to whom the consciousness of dependence and relation to God were two names for one thing. But it appeared indubitably in the Erlangen School, who built theology out from inward Christian experiences instead of guiding themselves directly by revelation. Wobbermin's eyes are resolutely open to Schleiermacher's defects, but he holds that a line can be drawn from Luther, through the best things in Schleiermacher, to meet present needs; a line that can be maintained firmly against traditional orthodoxy on the one hand, and rationalism on the other.

There are seven chapters, devoted to the modern crisis, theology as a science, the relation of theology to psychology and ethics, the Church, revelation, faith, and Scripture. All are well worth study, and serve admirably their purpose of placing the reader *en rapport* with the living issues of the hour. They cannot be here studied in detail, but any one who wishes to taste Wobbermin's quality at its best may be advised to read his observations on the religious truth Kant missed by his rigid emphasis on the autonomy of morality; or again, his important pages on the New Testament conception of the Church, and the distinction he rightly finds in apostolic thought between the Church as the object of faith and the Church as acting ecclesiastically, *i.e.* exhibiting in a real degree the marks of an organized society. Still more important is his emphasis on the close relation in which the *fides qua creditur* necessarily stands to the *fides quae creditur.* 'Faith as a subjective attitude of the believer can only be understood by reference to its objective content or counterpart.' This counterpart is, of course, revelation. And Wobbermin makes the good point that *all* revelation is supernatural; there can be no such thing as a purely natural revelation. We cannot really know God except as He desires to be known and makes Himself apprehensible; no view of God that grew up 'of itself' in the human mind, owing nothing to God's self-disclosing action, could have any value.

Barth's services in the fight against Historism and Psychologism are warmly acknowledged. But he is charged with falling back into an unfortunate dogmatism, which prevents his being fully sensitive to the need for historical research; nor does he do justice to the truth which Psychologism caricatures, viz. the need to get at the inmost intentions and motives of faith which lie behind doctrinal expressions, so as to interpret these expressions from within. Too often 'religion' on Barth's lips is equivalent to magic. His dialectic method runs the danger of inviting once more the deleterious influence of speculative thought in theology; and significantly enough, he makes Scripture only one source for Dogmatics amongst others. Other criticisms are to the effect that Barth defines theology as the science of God, so reverting to scholasticism; that he makes man evil as such, *i.e.* verges on Manicheanism; and that his view of revelation is gravely intellectualistic. One may acknowledge the detailed force and point of most of this without at all ceasing to feel the religious power of Barth's teaching as a whole. Nothing but good can result from such carefully considered criticism of a thinker who deserves all the critical care that can be spent upon him.

One point on our own account. Wobbermin, on p. 109, quotes Luther as contending that the Divine promise and human faith are correlative. Then he adds, still reporting Luther's thought, 'where there is no promise, there can be no faith; *and, conversely, where faith is lacking, the promise is nothing.*' But surely the italicized words are either but a rhetorical expression of the fact that a promise not received by faith misses its mark, or they are wholly wrong. My lack of faith does not make the promise void. I have no doubt Wobbermin would cordially agree, but it will not do even to *seem* to invest faith with a quasi-creative power, when, in point of fact, it is but a response to the initial self-unveiling act of God. Any ambiguity on this point—and in theology we are inevitably judged by our words rather than our intentions—immediately forms a full justification for Barth's insistence on the sovereign priority of God in everything that concerns salvation. The point I am insisting on has been made so forcibly and felicitously by Wobbermin himself elsewhere in this candid and readable book that it is perhaps ungrateful to dwell upon it now.

---

[1] *Richtlinien evangelischer Theologie.* By Professor Georg Wobbermin (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, pp. 145).

H. R. Mackintosh.

Edinburgh.

Two articles in the last number of the *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft*[1] are devoted to Ecclesiasticus: one in French, by Dom Donatien de Bruyne, which deals with the prologue, the title, and the conclusion, and emphasizes the complicated nature of both the Greek and Latin texts; the other, by Gottfried Kuhn, offering textual notes on the first sixteen chapters. Starting from the prohibition in Ex 20^4, Obbink, of Utrecht, discusses the question of Jahweh-images, and concludes by denying their existence. Jeroboam's bull, for example, was really a pedestal on which the unseen Jahweh sat (cf. the Ark). The images used in the Jahweh cult were not images of Jahweh, but symbols borrowed from heathen worship, and what the commandment forbids is this syncretistic Baalization of Jahweh. In a grammatical discussion which carefully considers all the relevant passages, Professor Albrecht argues that in the Old Testament את never stands before a nominative, while the use of את with a passive is confined to its connexion with an infinitive and with the passive forms of יָלַד. W. W. Cannon, discussing Is 61^{1-3}, maintains that it is an Ebed-Jahweh poem. He points out its affinities with the other four poems, but admits that it adds nothing to our knowledge of the character or career of the Servant: it is the picture of him 'as he appeared before the promise of his radiant youth was obscured and blotted out by disaster, ruin, and death.'

J. E. McFadyen.

Glasgow.

Francis of Assisi.[2]

The new series of the 'Sammlung Ausgewaehlter Kirchen- und Dogmengeschichte Quellenschriften,' to which students of Church History are already indebted, now provides in this monograph an excellent source-book for the study of the saint. It is a new edition, by Professor Wiegand, of Boehmer's collection of the works of Francis, with some textual and bibliographical notes. The authentic writings come first, then the four doubtful works, including the exposition of the Lord's Prayer, and finally the spurious Regula. To these are appended a number of personal data about the saint and his rule, including testimonies regarding the stigmata. Those who cannot acquire a large edition of the works of Francis are amply provided for by this cheap and scholarly book. It ought to be in the hands of any one interested in the saint, for it gives his actual writings in Latin, with the famous canticle of the Sun in its mixture of Latin and Italian. Certainly there is no handbook for students of Francis to be compared with this. Both editor and publishers are to be congratulated on its appearance.

Luther on Hebrews.[3]

Luther lectured on the Epistle to the Hebrews at an early stage of his career, in 1517–18. His lectures lack the maturity of those on Romans, but they possess an interest of their own as reflecting the writer's mind. Thus, as Herr Vogelsang points out, Luther betrays a distinct linguistic care, which is allied to the humanistic culture of the day; he is alive to the need of accurate exegesis in order to understand Scripture. He criticises, on the basis of Hebrews, the contemporary Roman church with its pilgrimages and fasts and external ceremonies. But he distinguishes sharply between the humanistic conception of a religious morality and the Christian stress on repentance and forgiveness. The lectures on Hebrews give him the opportunity of bringing out this contrast and of reiterating the quality of faith as a personal attitude towards God for which the individual is responsible, an attitude which corresponds to the revelation of God in Christ as the sinless High Priest.

Herr Vogelsang discusses such aspects of the lectures mainly with a view to elucidating the relation of Luther towards Humanism. His essay appears in the wake of two separate editions of the lectures, one by Ficker and the other by Hirsch and Rueckert, so that the student is now equipped with all material needful.

The Ottoman Turks.[4]

The recent *volte face* on the part of Turkey gives point to Herr Tschudi's fresh and admirably clear sketch of the Ottoman Turks as they came forward ultimately in the rôle of champions of Islam. He argues, with many modern scholars, that it was the capture of Constantinople by the crusaders of Christendom in 1204, not the final seizure by the Turks in 1453, which proved fatal to New Rome. The historical reasons for the push of the Turks into the West are analysed in the light of recent researches by Giese and Silberschmidt, and high praise is given to the sultan Mahomed II. for his patronage of culture as well as for his astute religious policy. Oddly enough, the friendly attitude of this sultan in the fifteenth century has been reproduced to-day by the nationalistic movement in Turkey, which has at once sought some approximation to European civilization and, as the price of this gain, repudiated the pan-Islamic rôle of the earlier Ottoman conquerors.

---

[1] 1929, Heft 4 (Töpelmann, Giessen; M.4.50).

[2] *Analekten zur Geschichte des Franciscus von Assisi* (Mohr, Tübingen; M.3.40).

[3] *Luthers Hebraerbrief-Vorlesung* (Mohr, Tübingen; M.1.80).

[4] *Vom Alten Osmanischen Reich*, von Professor Rudolf Tschudi (Mohr, Tübingen; M.1.80).

New Testament Thinking.[1]

Herr Stauffer's pamphlet is concerned with the methods used by the New Testament writers, especially St. Paul, in stating their convictions. This morphology he distinguishes from 'Formgeschichte,' the latter dealing with æsthetic and literary or historical data, the former with the logic of thought. He starts from the fifteenth chapter of First Corinthians, where historical assertion accompanies proof from Scripture and religious intuition, the argument being progressive and helped out by analogies and axioms. The Apostle, he argues, like the other writers of the primitive Church, uses traditional forms in order to state his intuitions. This took place in a world where the Greek mind was primarily interested in the being of God, and the Jewish mind in the rules governing the relationship between God and man. In the Mandæan theology Herr Stauffer discovers a third type of thought, which emphasized the name of the Deity, whereas the Greek stressed the conception and the Jew the regulations of the Deity. In Paul and the other New Testament writers the category is represented by terms like ἀρχή, τέλος, ὥρα, καιρός, αἰών, and μαρτυρία, since the fact of the Resurrection (ἐγήγερται) necessitated such new forms of expression and categories of thought in order to do justice to the characteristic belief. All such categories, according to Herr Stauffer, go back to the intuition of the resurrection of Jesus as an act of God in the world-order, and he discusses in this relation the prophetic consciousness and the primitive attempts to explicate such supernatural phenomena in other faiths. There is an excellent analysis of the martyr-consciousness in Paul and in Ignatius, on the lines of Lohmeyer, but Herr Stauffer's real service is that he brings out the originality of the Christian consciousness even as he discusses what is common to its categories of expression and those of contemporary religion. He has struck out a new line of discussion, which is fruitful, more fruitful for theology than much of what is being written by adherents of the 'Formgeschichte' school.

The Primitive Soul.[2]

In this lecture, delivered last August at Lund, Professor Bertholet compares the two conceptions of the soul in primitive life. Some held that this 'something' which made a man a living being was a sort of semi-spiritual stuff, connected with his hair or blood. Such a view, which practically identified the soul with a power of life or a substance of vital energy, is called 'dynamismus.' On the other hand, the soul might be conceived as a personal power personality which resides in the body and may leave it as in a trance. This is termed 'Personalismus.' The latter is to be traced in Greek religion and in Persian. After a brief study of the data furnished by comparative religion, the author points out that our conventional distinction between personality and power did not exist for the 'primitive mind'—a statement which hardly answers to the facts of the case. The argument of the lecture, which is alert and incisive, is that the assumption of the personal idea being necessarily later than the dynamical is not well founded; also it marks a reaction against the 'rational' element in animistic theories like those of E. B. Tylor.

James Moffatt.

New York.

---

[1] *Grundbegriffe einer Morphologie des Neutestamentlichen Denkens*, by E. Stauffer (Bertelsmann, Gütersloh; M.3).

[2] *Dynamismus und Personalismus in der Seelenauffassung*, by Alfred Bertholet. In the 'Sammlung gemeinverstaendlicher Vorträge und Schriften aus dem Gebiet der Theologie und Religionsgeschichte' (Mohr, Tübingen; M.1.80).

Contributions and Comments.

An Historical Place in Jerusalem.

In the accounts of the surrender of Jerusalem to General Allenby in 1917, it has been recorded that the ceremonies at that time took place at 'the Citadel' under the 'Tower of David.' But the deeper interest to Christians concerning that place has not been noticed.

According to Sanday, Schürer, Mommsen, and others, the lower courses of the Tower of David (which are probably Herodian) are all that remains of 'Hippicus,' built by Herod the Great, as one of the towers adorning his palace in Jerusalem. In the general destruction of the city by Titus, part of the tower was left standing, and the name 'Tower of David' became attached to it. The name 'Citadel' probably commemorates the four centuries of Turkish occupation, and the tall erection most easily seen probably does not date earlier than the Saracenic period.

The Roman governor had no private palace in Jerusalem, but (as representing the supreme overlord) Pontius Pilate, with his wife and retinues of soldiers, would have been received with all honour at the palace of the subordinate local king in a building arranged for public purposes. Wherever the Procurator was in residence the building would doubtless, for the time being, have been called The Pretorium. The Pretorium at Cesarea, where Pilate mostly lived, was also a palace built by the same Herod. The Revisers of the New Testament have, therefore, translated the Pretorium of the Gospels, where Pilate and his wife were staying at the time of our Lord's trial at Jerusalem, as 'the palace.' They have been equally careful to state the place of St. Paul's detention as the 'castle.' For he was preaching in the Temple courts, and was taken by the soldiers up the staircase to the castle of Antonia which overlooked the Temple.

The sending of our Lord to Herod by Pilate would, therefore, not have necessitated any crossing of the city from the Temple precincts (for which there would have been no time), but merely a movement to another part of the same building.

The Hall of Judgment in Herod's palace opened into a courtyard still remaining. The priests and their company would not enter the Hall of Judgment on the first Good Friday 'because of the Preparation,' but remained in the courtyard; and to them Pilate went out four or five times and then returned to the Hall to question our Lord afresh. Finally, Pilate, accompanied by the Lord wearing the purple robe and the crown of thorns, went to the *Bema* (the Judgment-seat) to pronounce the sentence of death. This spot is called in the Gospels, the Pavement (*i.e.* the Roman Mosaic Pavement), in Hebrew, *Gabbatha*. Our Lord stood beside him, and Pilate, greatly impressed, pointed to Him and called Him 'your King,' perhaps hoping at the last moment to sway the mind of the assembled crowd, whom he could address from this raised parapet or terrace, built beyond the courtyard on the outside of the wall.

The procession to Calvary would have passed out of the Gennath Gate—near the present Jaffa Gate—to the place where, in 326, Constantine the Great built the Church of the Holy Sepulchre.

The great gateway into the Hall of Judgment and the courtyard surrounding it still survive; so does the raised terrace on the outside of the wall of the courtyard to which Pilate mounted in order to address the crowd which had gathered together to support the priests. The present gatehouse on the wall of the courtyard appears to be of Saracenic structure, but the pillared building originally placed here was of Roman grandeur, and there are still traces of the Roman mosaic pavement on, and near, this site.

It was from this place that Titus addressed and thanked his soldiers and distributed rewards. It had, apparently, been originally built by Herod the Great as a convenient place for public utterances.

It was from this place that Lord Allenby made his proclamation of toleration for the three chief religions of the world. Afterwards, we read, he retired into the courtyard behind the gatehouse, and there received the notabilities of the city. Three months later, he himself was invested in the same place, by the Duke of Connaught, with the Order of St. John of Jerusalem.

No attention has been publicly drawn to the astonishing interest of this spot, where the greatest event in the history of the world was enacted, and where the formal abrogation of Pilate's verdict was announced in the name of the Christian Allies, who, after more than a thousand years, took over the government of the Holy Land from the hand of unbelievers. C. Anne E. Moberly.

Oxford.

Entre Nous.

A Christian Home in Rome.

It has been said, and with some truth, that the Church of to-day is composed almost entirely of the middle class. It was quite otherwise with the Early Church, as we see once more in a book—*The Rome of Saint Paul* (R.T.S.; 7s. 6d. net)—which has just been written by the Rev. Albert G. Mackinnon, M.A., D.D. Soaked in traditionary lore and full of imagination, Dr. Mackinnon has made a special study of the Rome of New Testament days. One of the most interesting chapters in the book is on 'Some Christian Homes in Rome.' Excavations have been going on lately in the cemetery of St. Priscilla, and the tomb of Acilius Glabrio has been found. 'A little circle of graves of freedmen and slaves surrounds the tomb of their master, Acilius Glabrio. These, too, bear the marks of Christian faith. They tell the story of the influence of a strong, fearless martyr. It may be difficult for a man to be a hero to his own valet, but Glabrio was, or else there would not have been so many of his household who followed in his steps.' Another name closely associated with this cemetery by tradition, and closely associated with the Church of St. Paul's day, is that of Pudens, an army officer and a wealthy senator, who is specially interesting to us not only because of his link with St. Paul, but because of his link with England, for he went to England as second in command of his company. He shared in the Roman victory over Caractacus, and he accompanied the captured king and his daughter to Rome. 'In Rome a royal welcome awaited him. Claudius was in a happy mood, and received with worthy hospitality the conquered king. He gave him a palace to live in, and in return Caractacus changed the name of his daughter to Claudia, as a compliment to the Emperor.'

In A.D. 53 Martial announces the coming wedding of Pudens and Claudia. 'Claudia Peregrina Rufus is about to be married to my friend Pudens. Be propitious, Hymen, with thy torches. As fitly is precious cinnamon united with nard, and Massic wine with Attic honey. Nor are elms more fitly wedded to tender vines, the lotus more love the waters, or the myrtle the river's bank. Mayest thou always hover over their couch, fair Concord; and may Venus ever be auspicious to a couple so well matched. In after-years may the wife cherish her husband in his old age; and may she, when grown old, not seem so to her husband.' Dr. Mackinnon comments on Martial's words: 'A marriage wish could not be better expressed, and in this case it came true. It was a union of two souls tuned to each other. They became united in the most glorious of all enterprises—that of establishing the Church of Christ in Rome, and ministering to its greatest Apostle.'

We do not know how the conversion of Pudens came about. Reverent imagination, says Dr. Mackinnon, may fill in the gap, 'and as soon as it is given rein it leads me to Priscilla [the wife of Aquila]. . . . There seems to have been a connection, however, more than merely the Christian bond, between the Priscilla of the Aventine and the aristocratic lady of the same name who was the mother of Pudens. It is just possible that the former took her name from her patroness. It was not an unusual custom in ancient Rome. If so, and my supposition is right, then she repaid that honour a hundredfold.

'On returning from Corinth to Rome, I can imagine Priscilla seeking out all her friends and relations, and telling them the Good News which Paul had brought to her and her husband. Among others, she would come to the house of Pudens, and probably, being a favourite with his mother, having been called after her, she would be encouraged to open her heart.' And so the new life reformed the home of this older Priscilla. Did Claudia learn of the new faith from her husband, and did she in turn tell the news to her father Caractacus, so that when Nero allowed the return to England in A.D. 58 he carried the good news to his kinsfolk?

From Pastor, the son of Hermes, we learn at any rate that 'Pudens went to his Saviour, leaving his daughters strengthened with chastity and learned in all the divine law. These sold their goods, and distributed the produce to the poor, and persevered strictly in the love of Christ. They desired to have a baptistry in their house, to which the blessed Pius (who was Bishop of Rome, A.D. 142–57) not only consented, but with his own hand drew the plan of the fountain. On his suggestion the enfranchisement of the Christian slaves was declared, with all the ancient usages, in the oratory founded by Pudens.' The family of Pudens consisted of two daughters and two sons; one of the sons, Novatus, built extensive baths. After his death their central hall was turned by his sister into a church. 'At the present moment, below the church, the baths are being disclosed, and one can see the perfect system of heating adopted by the architects of that time. The church itself is considered the oldest in Rome. It is mentioned in inscriptions of the fourth century. We know that it was restored by Siricius, who was bishop from A.D. 384 to A.D. 398, and he is supposed to have placed in the apse that magnificent mosaic whose freshness and beauty still attract the admiration of visitors. . . . The picture represents Christ in the centre, enthroned, and holding a book in His hand. The Roman artist has left his mark on the figure, for it has all the majestical air of a Jupiter, and the disciples in their togas might well be taken for Roman senators. On each side stand the two sisters offering crowns. The background is interesting. It represents a great villa: can it be a reproduction of the house of Pudens itself? If so, then we have an extant picture of the noble residence where Paul must have been a welcome visitor. The chained prisoner, with his guard, would have no hesitation in approaching that courtly mansion with its pillared courts, for the key of Christ's love had turned the lock.'

'We cannot leave this gracious home with its hospitable inmates without connecting it with that very last message of St. Paul in the closing verses of 2 Timothy: "Eubulus greeteth thee, and Pudens, Linus, and Claudia . . ." Something tells us that it would just be like the Claudia we have depicted, to show her loyalty to the Apostle at the very last, even though in those dark days of his second imprisonment, when he was deserted by so many, such devotion might mean death.'

W. H. Temple Gairdner to his Friends.

Writing was no labour to Temple Gairdner. He wrote long letters to his friends and children, and papers on the greatest diversity of subjects and at all times and places. Only short extracts from these could be given in the excellent biography lately published (S.P.C.K.; 5s. net). Now the biographer, Constance Padwick, has inspired the publication of a volume of extracts from these letters and informal writings. It is a delightful book for the less strenuous moments. Gairdner was a man of the widest interests—like the great Apostle, all things were his to enjoy. The last extracts are on Elgar's Second Symphony. This is preceded by a chapter on the writings of H. G. Wells. Very charming are his letters to his children. Almost at random we quote his reply to a letter which said, 'In all art I find temptation,' and a letter which he sent to his old nurse when he was an Oxford undergraduate.

If thine eye offend.

'I feel that the whole letter is a deeply interesting and moving exhibition of the first stage—the earliest, best, purest and most beautiful stage—of *Puritanism*: of Puritanism when it is itself instinct with the very beauty it feels it must so sternly limit and repress (so different from the coarse later stage, when beauty is flouted by those who were never capable of even knowing her!)—the stage of Milton, where repression itself is apt to produce some masterpiece of the very beauty that is abjured, some beautiful masterpiece cold, stern, unearthly. I feel that his attitude is too much conditioned by *reaction* (the reaction caused by some irretrievable personal error) to be valid as a full or final philosophy or synthesis of the subject. Is it not rather the attitude of one who has righteously and faithfully obeyed the command of Christ to pluck out the offending eye and cut off the offending limb, . . . and yet the eye and the limb, in *others* who were not offended, are good and fair, are God's creation, and are moreover necessary to the completeness of the body. The amputated one is not one to frame the formula of completeness.' [1]

Underneath are the Everlasting Arms.

'I remember when I was a little boy after bathing in the sea at Ardrossan, I used to be enveloped in a huge warm towel, and carried from the rocks to the Villa. And as I felt the warmth after the cold sea, the comfortable being carried after the sharp stones, and the strong arms of the nurse, and heard the gravel crunching under her feet, I just clean *abandoned myself* to her, knew how safe I was, and wished the walk would never come to an end. That was all trust, utter abandonment. I knew I should not be dropped.

'That has *often* come back to me so clear that I can hardly imagine it happened seventeen or eighteen years ago. And it seems to me to be a *picture* of our faith in the strong arms of our Lord: a child's clinging, unquestioning and entire. Why, Mary, surely you must yourself have been that very nurse.

'To show my gratitude to you then, let the bread cast upon the waters come back to you after many days. Take it as a real picture of Christ carrying us. And when we have abandoned ourselves to His keeping, He *will* keep. He won't let us drop.' [2]

---

[1] *W. H. T. G. to his Friends*, 110.

[2] *Ibid.*, 78.

The Divine Tragedy.

Mr. St. John Adcock's poems have appeared in many journals, and they have also been published in book form. Now he has made a collection from the various books of what he considers best worth preserving, and the volume has been published by Messrs. Hodder & Stoughton at 7s. 6d. net—*Collected Poems of St. John Adcock.* All his best-known lyrics are here, the vernacular poem, 'The Anzac Pilgrim's Progress,' and three long satirical poems. The most considerable of these is 'The Divine Tragedy.' Smooth-flowing and with rich imagination it expresses more than any of the others Mr. St. John Adcock's own deeply-moving Christian faith. In it Christ comes to the world again, once more as a Jew and as a humble carpenter, and He is rejected the second time as He was the first. How is He treated? This is the attitude of the Vicar and of Lady Pomphrey Gauden, whose husband, once a grocer in a small way, has made money, is a member of Parliament, and has been knighted.

'My trust,' said Lady Pomphrey, 'is in you.
Tell me, dear Vicar, what I ought to do.'

'As I have told you, under his intense
Magnetic and bewildering influence,
I was almost persuaded to avow
Faith in the Man's identity. But now,
Now I am calm, and glad that I deferred
Deciding, for I see I should have erred.
We must be wise as serpents; we must tread
With prayerful caution, lest we be misled.
I thought at first it might be well if I
Invited him to come and occupy
My pulpit, but have now abjured the plan.'
'He is not, I suppose, an Anglican?'
'Probably not, and, in this calmer state,
I feel our proper course will be to wait
And—while our judgments in suspense we keep,
To see more of him—look before we leap.'

'Those,' said my Lady, 'are my views exact.'
Then, thinking how, with courage and with tact,
She might for social daring reap renown,
Be the most talked-of hostess in the town,
She added, 'If you think he won't decline,
I might perhaps invite him here to dine. . . .
But would a Man of this one's class possess—
Not that it greatly matters—evening dress?'
'Dear Lady, I should doubt it very much.'
'Ah! Well, the better way to come in touch
With one that all society, no doubt,
Will soon be getting curious about
Might be to send a note and ask him to
An afternoon reception—that would do.'

Mr. St. John Adcock touches with his biting sarcasm, amongst others, the successful politician of to-day. The poem ends with the imprisonment of Christ and with His disappearance in the morning from the cell.

It is far better He should only be
A tale we need not take too seriously,
An Ideal throned above our fallen state
For us to worship, not to imitate.
The great Reality we praise in prayers
Could ne'er be fitted into our affairs;
If It came down, we must in self-defence
Reject It, and restrain Its influence,
Harden our hearts, and warn It from our bowers
With, 'No admittance during business hours.'

Errata.

We regret that a paragraph has been transposed in the Contribution found on the last page of the April issue of this magazine. The last paragraph of Mr. Mathieson's letter has found its way into Mr. Scott's, and is given as his third paragraph. It deals with S. A. Cook's dating of the second edition of Robertson Smith's *Prophets*.

We might, perhaps, also call attention to an obvious error which was alas, however, not noted when an extract was given from a children's sermon by Mr. Stuart Robertson last December—'The last week of December,' he said, 'is the time when the sun is farthest from the earth.' Mr. Robertson writes: 'Thank you for the letters enclosed, and thanks to the writers for their correction of my blunder. I can only say what Dr. Johnson said when a lady asked him why he had defined the "pastern" in his dictionary as "the knee of a horse," "Ignorance, madam, sheer ignorance." I have undoubtedly taken unpardonable liberties with those august astronomical entities, Perihelion and Aphelion. I apologize to them abjectly, and hereby promise that if there be a second edition I shall amend my ways and do them justice.'

Printed by Morrison & Gibb Limited, Tanfield Works, and Published by T. & T. Clark, 38 George Street, Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to The Editor, Kings Gate, Aberdeen, Scotland.

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

A symposium can hardly fail to be interesting, provided the subject of it is sufficiently important and the contributors to it are sufficiently competent. It will be admitted that these conditions are more than adequately met where the subject is Hell and the contributors include some of the most eminent names of the day in the fields of religion, science, and literature respectively. The exact title of the symposium to which we invite attention is *What is the Real Hell?* (Cassell; 3s. 6d. net), and the contributors are Dean Inge, Sir Oliver Lodge, Abbot Butler, Warwick Deeping, Bishop Welldon, Professor Moffatt, Annie Besant, Sheila Kaye-Smith, Ernest Raymond, the Rev. W. E. Orchard, the Rev. F. W. Norwood, G. Hay Morgan, K.C., and Professor Irwin Edman.

A sufficient diversity of outlook might well be anticipated from a group of thinkers of calibre so diverse; but, curiously enough, in what they have to say there is a surprising unanimity. It may be true, as one of the writers says, that we are left, as we must inevitably be left in our present state of knowledge, with a whole heap of unresolved difficulties and unanswered questions; but the writers, one and all, believe in Hell. Not indeed in the old traditional Hell; for Hell, like man himself, as Mr. Deeping reminds us, has had a history. There is a Stone Age Hell, a Bronze Age Hell, the Hell of the Middle Ages, and the Hell of the Now and To-morrow. But of the reality of some Hell the writers have no doubt whatever.

Here are some of their testimonies. 'We know,' says Dean Inge, 'that there is a Hell, for we have been there, or very near it.' 'Belief in Hell,' according to Dr. Moffatt, 'is an element of any religion which is morally healthy.' 'The man who repudiates Hell absolutely'—thus Dr. Norwood—'has either had a shallow experience, or is not true to the experience he has had. I believe in Hell as I believe in Man.' One of the strongest professions of faith in Hell is offered by one of the least orthodox of the contributors. Professor Edman reiterates his creed again and again. 'The free mind—if it recognizes the symbolic and revealing poetry of its symbols of God and Heaven—is both dishonest and inconsistent in refusing to recognize the permanent significance, the inescapable moral reality of Hell.' And again: 'What matter that the word sin is out of fashion, or that we have other more medical words for damnation. The fact and its consequences are still here.' And yet again: 'Of all the apparatus of the Christian tradition Hell has been most smiled at by the modern. Yet Hell is of all the theological notions that which empirically he knows best.'

But what is the Hell in which these writers believe, and how do they define it? There is little verbal agreement in their definitions. The representatives of the Church express themselves, as a rule, in religious language, while the others express themselves for the most part otherwise; but at bottom their meanings are not perhaps very far apart. It will be only fair, however, to let them speak for themselves.

According to Bishop **Welldon**, 'the essence of Hell, if rightly understood, seems to be remorse,' a remorse which springs from seeing sinful actions in their own light. Dr. **Orchard** suggests that Hell 'may mean simply an intense sense of what the deprivation of God means, combined with an equally intense determination to deprive oneself of Him: both together and all at once.'

Mr. **Deeping** describes Hell in more secular terms. To him it is the realization of one's failure, it is 'to look back at the dim, reproachful faces of those who loved us, those whom we betrayed,' 'to stand at the end of one's days and to know that the landscape you have painted is grey, a place of stones, and of the bones of broken memories.' For Sheila **Kaye-Smith**, Hell is 'nothing more or less than a complete or eternal state of self-absorption.' Similarly Ernest **Raymond**: 'Hell is that undeniable cursedness won by the wholly self-centred.' To Mr. **Morgan** it 'is the condition or the state of the Spirit suffering the agony of remorse for wrong done and good left undone in this life'; while to Professor **Edman** it is 'to live deprived of all possibility of the Good'—some central good upon which the heart is set.

There is not only a substantial unanimity of thought among most of the contributors, but also at times a curious unanimity of expression and frequent use of the same material, both Biblical and extra-Biblical. Twice, for example, we are reminded that the last farthing must be paid; and twice that the Judge of all the earth will do right; twice Christ's parable of the Day of Judgment is recalled; twice His preaching to the spirits in prison is brought up; and several references occur to His solemn word, 'Fear not them that kill the body . . . but fear him who after he hath killed hath power to cast into hell,' though it is rather remarkable, considering the variety of outlook represented by the contributors, that none of them has been induced by the gracious conception of God in the immediate context (Lk 12$^{6f.}$) to think of the one who has power to cast into hell as the Devil.

Even from secular literature the same quotations recur. Twice there are allusions to 'Adam Bede,' and twice to Fitzgerald's line, 'And Hell the shadow from a soul on fire.' Calvinists will be grieved to note that two of the ablest writers independently refer to Calvin's 'sadistic' theology.

Twice appeal is made to the Bible in a way which reveals how ignorant even well-informed persons may be of its real meaning. One writer remarks, 'When it is said that the wicked shall be turned into hell, it may be a statement simply true when rightly interpreted.' But if, as seems certain, this is meant to be a reference to Ps 9^{17}, the writer would have done well to consult the Revised Version, where it is *not* said that the wicked will be turned into hell. The same mistake is made by another contributor, who, doubtless with Ps 139^{8} in view, writes of 'the truth hidden in the Psalmist's discovery that he had found God in Hell,' and adds, 'What could He be there for, He the all-loving, if not to rescue, to save?' It is always a perilous thing for the cobbler to go beyond his last.

The theologically minded contributors naturally appeal to Jesus, and it is not a little strange that in so diversified a volume, the question is only once raised whether He has been correctly reported. It is Dr. **Orchard**, in one of the ablest essays in the book, who reminds us that there are scholars who believe that the report of the teaching of Jesus on this subject has been affected by ideas cherished by the narrators, and scholars more daring still who doubt whether Jesus had worked out to their full consequences the implications of His own teaching about the Fatherhood of God.

But Dr. **Moffatt** is surely right when he says that, after making every allowance, 'it seems impossible to eliminate all the severe sayings of Jesus about the future from the tradition of His teaching.' Sir Oliver **Lodge** agrees: 'He did not scruple to speak of a state of outer darkness where there is weeping and gnashing of teeth.' And Bishop Welldon: 'Our Lord's language respecting the future invisible world must be figuratively understood; but nobody who reads it can mistake the awful solemnity of the relation between the present and the future lives.'

There is great diversity of opinion among the contributors on the destiny of man after death. Some argue that man is not inherently immortal, but 'immortable'—to use an abominable word, *i.e.* immortality is for him a possibility. Others believe that the soul enters upon a state of probation after death; others that in the end all will be saved, for God must in the end be 'all in all'; others that we know and can know nothing whatever about the future state. While Sir Oliver LODGE assures us that 'the gates of hell shall not prevail against the Divine goodness for ever,' Dean INGE, who has never believed in the inevitability of progress, will say no more than that 'if there is any future probation, it is absolutely unknown to us, and we have no right to assume any such thing.'

The old-fashioned Hell has certainly gone for ever. It has been driven out by science and by conscience, especially the Christian conscience. As Professor EDMAN says, 'it is incredible to our knowledge of astronomy, and revolting to our sense of justice.' Whatever the future may have in store, those who believe in God through Christ will look forward to it in the confident assurance that all that is done to us there will be done in justice and in love; the God revealed in Jesus Christ can be trusted to be neither unloving nor unjust.

But three things must be steadily borne in mind. One is that, on any view of the future, life in this world is of quite incalculable importance. The second is that the belief in God as Father is very far from being identical with the belief that 'He's a Good Fellow, and 'twill all be well.' A God who truly loved us would be quite certain to be much more than a merely good-natured, amiable God. The third is that, if free will is now and continues to be a reality, there can be no demonstrable and irrefragable certainty of final salvation for all; for so long as the conditions of the future state are unknown to us, how could there be any certainty that the soul that rejected the best that it knew in this world would embrace it with rapture in the world to come?

We may fittingly conclude this sketch of an interesting book in the words of Mr. Hay MORGAN, 'I am aware that all this is surmising. We can but guess—we cannot dogmatize. Yes, we can also hope.'

Among the thoughtful and scholarly readers of the Anglican Communion, Dr. A. E. J. RAWLINSON holds a distinctive place. He is, we imagine, an Anglo-Catholic of the broader type, neither an extremist nor an obscurantist, and in his recent book, *The Church of England and the Church of Christ* (reviewed in another column), he shows himself in an attractive light. We are, however, specially concerned here with one section of that book which may possibly turn out to be of special importance. It is an appendix with the heading 'The Doctrine of the Real Presence and the Possibility of an Eirenicon.' The suggestion in this brief essay is one that is worthy of careful consideration.

Dr. RAWLINSON begins with the distinctions which are traditional in regard to the Sacrament. These are the 'sign' or symbol, the bread and wine, the 'reality' (*res*), which is the Body and Blood of the Lord, and finally the 'virtue' or efficacy, which points to the benefits conveyed. And these point also to the distinct views held of the Sacrament. The purely symbolist view (associated with Zwingli) affirms that the Sacrament is merely a sign; the 'receptionist' view asserts that it is not merely a sign but an efficacious sign, a means of Divine grace which in effect conveys to those who rightly receive it the efficacy of Christ's Body and Blood; while those who affirm the doctrine of the Real Presence acknowledge the actuality and objectivity in the Sacrament of the *res sacramenti*, or 'thing signified.'

It has been said that 'the danger of the word "Presence" is its connotation of absence at other times.' But those who affirm a belief in the Real Presence would deny that their doctrine involves such a connotation. They discriminate different senses and meanings of the term 'presence.' They would agree that Christians are at all times and in all places in the presence of Christ. Yet they would affirm that there is in a real sense a special presence of Christ which is objectively mediated through the sacramental elements of bread and wine, which, in virtue of their consecration, are no longer *mere* bread and wine, but have become for faith's discernment in a real though mysterious sense Christ's Body and Blood.

Now the difficulties of this doctrine are obvious. What is at stake in the controversy is the affirmation of the actuality and objectivity in the Sacrament of the *res sacramenti*—Christ's Body and Blood. Is there any way of presenting this truth which may provide an eirenicon between 'Catholics' and 'Evangelicals'? The present Master of Corpus Christi College, Mr. Spens, has suggested such a way, and Dr. RAWLINSON is impressed with the possibilities of reconciliation that lie in his view. The essence of his view seems to lie in the belief that in the Lord's Supper there is not only a symbolism of action (as in Baptism), but also 'an effectual symbolism of objects.'

By an 'effectual symbol' is meant a symbol which does not merely convey a message but effects a result. A case in point would be token coinage, or paper money. A florin has not only the value of its intrinsic worth as silver, but a further value which is given to it by the State, and is capable of effecting results. So a pound note in itself is valueless, but, as a symbol of further value given to it by the will of the State, it is an 'effectual symbol' of a pound note. The essence of such symbolism is the association of certain results with certain visible signs by a will which is competent to bring about those results. Now in the case of the Eucharist the authority which invests the elements of bread and wine with a significance, character, and potency which did not belong to them before is the will of God, which is competent to bring about the results which are in view in the Holy Supper.

In other words, the bread and wine, from the moment of their consecration as media of the appointed Sacrament, become, for Christian faith, instinct, by a determination of the sovereign will of God, with a wholly new meaning and potency, a new character, a new set of capacities and properties. They become from henceforward the effectual symbols of Christ's Body and Blood, capable of mediating all that is meant and involved in eucharistic communion with Christ. They have acquired a new property, namely, that their devout reception secures and normally conditions participation in the blessings of Christ's sacrifice, and therefore in His life. In *this* sense, they have become, without any connotation of materialism (and also without any implication of cannibalism), Christ's Body and Blood. They have become Christ's Body and Blood '*simply in and through their becoming effectual symbols*.' (The italics are Dr. RAWLINSON'S.)

This is important, and may be expanded. An effectual symbol is rightly described (as we saw in the case of a pound note), not in terms of its original and natural properties, but in terms rather of its new and acquired significance and efficacy, *i.e.* in terms of the reality which it effectually symbolizes. If this holds good even in the case of a piece of paper, which by a determination of the will of the State has the significance and efficacy of a pound sterling, *a fortiori* it holds good in the case of the eucharistic gifts, which by a determination of the will of God have the significance and efficacy of the Body and Blood of Christ. For the new spiritual significance and efficacy of the elements in their sacramental capacity are no less real than their original character and significance as merely natural objects. This would justify us speaking of the elements as Christ's Body and Blood simply as asserting that they render Him appropriable as our sacrifice.

The natural properties of the bread and wine, considered simply *as* bread and wine, remain wholly unchanged. But now, from the point of view of faith, these are irrelevant. What is significant about the elements *now* is that they have become the potential media of communion, that they are (' in the sense indicated, though not, of course, in any other sense ') the Body and Blood of Christ. It is precisely because the devout reception of the elements unites us to Christ—it is upon the ground of the new significance, capacity, and efficacy which from henceforth attach, by Christ's appointment, to the consecrated elements in virtue of their consecration—that they can be rightly called the Body and Blood of Christ. They are a *focus*, in time and space, for the objective worship of Christ as our sacrifice.

We have set forth this remarkable statement at length, because it is an effort to build a bridge between reasonable Evangelicals and reasonable Anglo-Catholics. And it does seem to hold out a prospect of a common understanding. The reasonable Evangelical will probably reflect, 'if the elements are only effectual symbols (in the full sense of these words as explained) as a paper note is an effectual symbol, then there is no change in the actual element. As the pound note remains paper, and is only invested with greater properties by the will of the State, so the elements remain bread and wine, and are invested with higher value by the will of God. There does not seem to be any ground for serious difference in such a view, and I need not find any ground of serious criticism in the devotional language in which devout souls may clothe this faith.' Probably extremists in both camps will remain unreconciled, but Dr. RAWLINSON is appealing beyond them to the large company of earnest and open-minded Christians in both camps. And he may find sympathy and understanding among them.

The Virgin Birth of Christ (Marshall, Morgan & Scott; 15s. net), by Professor J. Gresham MACHEN, D.D., Litt.D., is a notable contribution to conservative Christian apologetics. Though he is now Professor of New Testament in Westminster Theological Seminary, Philadelphia, Dr. MACHEN is an inheritor of the Princeton theological tradition, standing in the succession of Charles Hodge and Benjamin Warfield. Indeed, much of the matter contained in this volume has already appeared, sometimes in more elaborate form, in the *Princeton Theological Review*. Whatever we may think of Dr. MACHEN's doctrinal standpoint, we cannot but be impressed by his learning and ability, and recognize that in this respect also his name may fitly be placed alongside those of Hodge and Warfield.

Two explanations are possible of the Church's belief in the Virgin Birth of Jesus of Nazareth. One is that Jesus was actually conceived by the Holy Ghost and born of the Virgin Mary. That explanation Dr. MACHEN considers in chapters i.–xi., in which he examines the positive testimony to the Virgin Birth and the objections that have been raised against it. The other explanation is that through some sort of error the Church came to accept the Virgin Birth as a fact. That explanation is considered in chapters xii.–xiv., in which the alternative theories that would elucidate the origin of the idea of the Virgin Birth are examined. The exposition tends at times to become prolix and commonplace, and even to repeat itself; on the other hand, this is counterbalanced by a wholly admirable lucidity.

An analysis of the work will show its scope and standpoint more clearly. But let us preface our analysis with the remark that Dr. MACHEN does little to meet the main difficulty attaching to the doctrine of the Virgin Birth. It is not enough to show (if it is shown) that the Virgin Birth tradition is securely imbedded in the Gospels and that, if it is not true, its origin has not been explained. The difficulty concerning the doctrine is scientific or biological rather than critical and historical; and all that Dr. MACHEN can say in this reference is that the fact of the Virgin Birth is a miracle—a miracle in no lower sense than that it represents 'an intrusion into the order of nature of the creative power of God.'

First comes a learned investigation of the second-century testimony to the Virgin Birth; as a result of which it would appear that a firm and well-formulated belief in this doctrine extends back to the early years of the second century, and that the denials of it in the second century were probably based upon philosophical or dogmatic prepossession, whether on the part of individuals like Carpocrates and Cerinthus, or on the part of groups like the obscure sect of the Ebionites. Following up this investigation, Dr. Machen considers the birth and infancy narrative in the Third Gospel, and reaches the conclusion that if literary criticism has established anything at all, it has established the fact that this is an integral part of the Third Gospel.

The genuinely Palestinian character of Lk 1^5–2^{52} in general is then vindicated; after which special consideration is given to the Magnificat and the Benedictus, which are represented as not—as in Harnack's view—artificial compositions of a Gentile Christian, but as confirmative of the author's opinion as to the Semitic and Palestinian origin of the whole narrative. It is uncertain whether the narrative was composed by Luke himself on the basis of Aramaic oral tradition or of a Semitic document, or whether the source, if it came into Luke's hands in a Greek form, was composed originally in Greek, or in Hebrew, or in Aramaic. But in the midst of so much uncertainty the fact of its genuinely primitive and Palestinian character, it is held, stands out clear.

Here Dr. Machen has to face the theory of interpolation. Many modern scholars grant the Palestinian origin of Lk 1^5–2^{52}, but declare that attestation of the Virgin Birth formed no original part of the narrative. This theory is carefully examined in its various forms; and in particular Völter's theory is refuted, that those parts of Lk 1 which concern Jesus (including the mention of the Virgin Birth) are secondary elements in a process of literary manipulation. The Virgin Birth, it is contended, is no secondary element in the Lucan narrative.

Turning to the narrative in Matthew, Dr. Machen holds that, even granted to Merx that the original reading in 1^{16} is 'Joseph begat Jesus,' no conclusion derogatory to the attestation of the Virgin Birth would necessarily follow. As Burkitt points out, the word 'begat' in the genealogy simply means 'had as a legal heir.' The physical paternity of Joseph is not asserted.

The relation between the infancy narratives in Matthew and in Luke is now considered, and the conclusion stated that they are on the one hand completely independent, and on the other hand not at all contradictory. This strengthens the external evidence for the Virgin Birth, and leads to the further consideration: Are the narratives inherently credible? This, as we remarked at the outset, is the crucial question. The answer will be given in the negative by those who are opposed in principle to an acceptance of the supernatural, or else do not believe that the supernatural is manifested in the life of Jesus and the beginnings of Christianity. But where the supernatural origin of Christianity is allowed, there should be no special objection, says Dr. Machen, on psychological or historical grounds to the infancy narratives.

Moreover, these narratives are congruous with the rest of the New Testament. 'If the question were simply whether a man about whom otherwise we knew nothing was born without human father, no doubt that question would have to be answered in the negative. But as a matter of fact that is not the question at all. The question is not whether an ordinary man was born without human father but whether Jesus was so born. . . . So unique a person, it might well be argued, may well have had a unique entrance into the world.'

So far chapters i.–xi., which occupy two-thirds of the book. A more modern conservative writer would probably have traversed the aforesaid ground more rapidly, and given more space, relatively speaking, to the discussions of the alternative theories which, on the assumption that Jesus of Nazareth was not really born of a virgin, seek to explain the origin of the belief in the Virgin Birth.

While saying this, we cannot but be grateful to Dr. MACHEN for his very full and fair-minded discussion of the theories of Jewish derivation and pagan derivation respectively—a discussion, we should add, which reckons with the findings of the most recent scholarship, as exemplified in works by Gressmann, Leisegang, and Norden.

As for the theory of Jewish derivation, the overwhelming majority of modern scholars are agreed that the story of the Virgin Birth is, in Merx's words, 'as un-Jewish as possible.' It never arose in the Jewish Christian Church on the basis of purely Jewish ideas. There has been a practically universal rejection of the view that the principal germ of the story is to be found in Is 7^{14} ('Behold the virgin shall conceive,' etc.). And as for the theory of pagan derivation, its advocates are divided among themselves. Some regard it as a reflex among Gentile Christians of the pagan notions about children begotten by the gods; others as an ancient pagan idea already naturalized in the pre-Christian Jewish doctrine of the Messiah. But neither of these theories has obtained anything like general assent.

In his concluding chapter Dr. MACHEN emphasizes the importance to his mind of belief in the Virgin Birth to the Christian man. It is important for the general question of the authority of the Bible. It is important as a test of our view of Jesus Christ, as to whether it is naturalistic or supernaturalistic. And it has an importance all its own. Without the story of the Virgin Birth there would be something seriously lacking in the Christian views of Christ. It is just here, however, that the modern dogmatician would be likely to join issue. In most modern theologies of the conservative type the doctrine of the Virgin Birth is not regarded as integral to the dogmatic system.

The Mind of Christ on Moral Problems of To-day.

V.

Marriage.

By the Reverend A. Herbert Gray, D.D., London.

It might well be thought that everything has been said about Marriage that can be said, and that there is no need for further writing about it. But if the real truth about it has often been declared, it has certainly not been generally believed and acted on. There is no subject on which to-day there is more confusion of thought, and there is still a vast amount of suffering in our midst due to the mismanagement of the married relationship. Wherefore it would seem to be worth while to attempt to state the truth about it as clearly as possible.

The mind of Christ about marriage must be understood rather by realizing the implications of the few things He said, than by insisting on the letter. His one great saying really goes to the root of the matter. 'He which made them at the beginning made them male and female, and said . . . they twain shall be one flesh.' That is an emphatic assertion that the intimacies of married life are part of the Divine intention. If that be so, they must be essentially beautiful and capable of forwarding the highest life of men and women. To think of them as almost shameful, or as mere manifestations of some animal element in our humanity, is to go wrong in thought from the first. Unless this central thing in life which we call marriage can, with all its various implications, be caught up into man's highest life and made to minister to the spirit, no complete redemption is possible for us. Assuredly if we are to be 'saved,' marriage must be 'saved.'

The one vital truth at the heart of this subject is also the central fact about sex. That truth is that the sex element, which is so central and masterful, alike in men and in women, makes possible a union of a man and a woman on all levels of their personalities so complete, harmonious, and joyous that it may well be considered the crown of this incarnate life. There is an instinctive sense in all of us which tells us that only through union with another can the self find its fullest life. We are insufficient to ourselves, and prolonged loneliness is of all tortures the most subtle and the most devastating. I think it is true that the only union which can ultimately perfectly and permanently satisfy any spirit is union with God Himself. In nothing less than that can we find our consummation. But in this incarnate life the fact of sex makes possible a union between two human beings which is the most beautiful and joyous thing which merely human experience can contain. When one man and one woman truly find each other they find something that completes life. They not only find joy in each other, but each is conscious that his or her personality has attained to harmony. The mystery and delight of the experience depend in large measure on the fact that the two are so profoundly different from each other, and so are able to supplement each other. Each brings a distinctive contribution to their common life. No doubt each will remain in some measure an unsolved problem to the other, but it will prove an intriguing and even a fascinating problem. Each will meet for the other some of the profoundest needs of our natures: the need for some one to share all æsthetic pleasures; the need for some one to share in the joy of success and uphold in hours of failure; the need of a confidante who can be absolutely trusted; the need of an answering mind; the need of a stay in hours of self-distrust and despair; the need of sympathy and understanding; the need of an object on which to lavish emotion; the need of one who will give love in a measure which can never be deserved.

It belongs to the essence of such a relationship that while each retains a measure of reverence for the other, there shall be no reserves. The intimacy of communion must be complete. And into such a relationship physical intimacy will enter naturally and spontaneously, as an inevitable happy and beautiful part of the general union of the two. It will occur as the harmonious culmination of mutual affectionate approach. In it the body will operate as the organ of the spirit, and mere bodily desire will be transmuted into an emotion of love in which the loved one fills the whole of consciousness. And this is found to involve a solution of the body's problem. Passion which has its roots so deep in the flesh achieves in this way an expression which is in harmony with the whole life of man or woman. Thus personality is unified, and the distractions, frictions, and strains of our disordered selves are resolved. Of such union children are the normal and ordained result; and with their advent, what had been a mere union of two persons broadens out into a many-sided companionship in the management of a home and a family. Nor until this happens is the married relationship purged of a certain selfishness which characterizes it at first. No wise person grudges to young lovers their absorption in each other, and their indifference to the rest of the world. But when that condition is deliberately prolonged it tends to cramp the growth of personality, and even to give marriage an anti-social aspect. The school of parentage, however, is the greatest of all schools for enforcing a certain moral discipline and for lifting men and women above their merely selfish concerns.

Only when this truth is perceived are we in a position to say that the sex element in our humanity leads normally to great and beautiful results. When it is perceived we have so far read the Divine intention. This is what passion and love were designed to lead to. This is why sex is so central and masterful a force in our humanity.

That such unions as I have tried to picture are comparatively rare does not affect the real issue. The possibility of them constitutes the goal in attaining to which humanity must at last find itself. If few can love to that degree of perfection, all may at least aim at such love. If most unions are interrupted by offences which call for much forgiveness, that only means that we are a host on the march and have not yet arrived.

The possibility of such unions was for the greater part of the past so dimly realized that marriage has, in fact, been something very different from what I have suggested. Often it amounted to little more than the ownership of a woman by a man. Later, when the idea of such ownership had been repudiated, it was still true that many men regarded their wives as little more than accessories to whom they might turn for relaxation in hours of leisure. The idea of a full and free companionship between equals as the very essence of marriage is only now beginning to attain recognition. It is not yet fully embodied in the law of any country, so far as I know. But no other conception of marriage is worth talking about. This alone is Christian. This alone satisfies the instinctive moral demands alike of men and women. We can only truly progress as we more fully embody this conception in life.

Let us note certain necessary implications of this view. *Firstly*, such unions are inevitably exclusive of other similar intimacies. Mr. Bertrand Russell, while endeavouring to claim much for marriage, and while capable of writing noble passages about it, still wants to claim for married persons liberty to indulge in subsidiary sex relations. But he never faces the fact that no man can give his whole self to two women. Nor can any woman give her whole self to two men. What a truly married man would be able to offer to another woman would be essentially of the nature of a passionate interlude, not a complete mutual sex relationship. And in such an offer there is involved a profound insult. A truly self-respecting woman would be bound to refuse it. Still further, the offer could only be made by a man who for the time being was not getting what he wanted out of his marriage. And that in turn would mean that instead of giving his mind to the development of a common life with his wife on such lines as were offering themselves, he was seeking for himself satisfaction apart from his wife, and so being disloyal to the demands of their common adventure.

I hold it to be an entirely unchristian view that such offences should never be forgiven either by husband or wife, or that they inevitably end the life of communion between the two. Love that is really love can forgive without limit. But such episodes ARE offences—offences against the mutual loyalty involved in the very conception of marriage. Real love gives everything—everything in the present, and everything for the future.

Secondly, and for the same reason, true marriage is lifelong marriage. What a man offers to a woman when he truly loves her is to be her companion through all the varied experiences of life unto the end. He proposes to enjoy with her her youth, to be her companion in the serious activities of middle life, and to learn with her how to fill life's evening with mutual sympathy and with what is well called in the marriage service 'cherishing.'

It may prove that what he has undertaken is at times no easy task. But real love does not ask only for easy tasks. The best of married life is not for beginners. The communion of love only enters on its highest phases when man and wife have come through much together—have survived through difficulties—have had to learn the worst of each other, and have been afresh bound to each other by forgiveness given and received. After such experiences there is a security and a peace in their love which the young can never know. And the vital relevance of this truth lies in the fact that when married persons propose from the first that they shall be free to part when difficulties appear, they renounce beforehand the best and most beautiful experiences which marriage can mean.

Real marriage, then, has five inevitable characteristics. 1. It is rooted in love. 2. It involves the body as well as the mind, and it ennobles bodily experience. 3. It issues in children—welcomed as the fruit of love. 4. It is exclusive of other intimate sex relationships; and 5. It is a lifelong partnership.

A separate article would be needed to discuss adequately the subject of the terms on which society ought to be willing to release two persons from the marriage bond.

Our present procedure is certainly open to severe criticism. Divorce to-day is possible for those who will stoop to subterfuge or open infidelity, and is denied to those who refuse such degradation.

It is granted for certain specific reasons which do not include some of the most subtle and intense forms of cruelty. And as a result acute suffering is common.

Personally, I believe that the number of grounds on which divorce may be granted ought to be increased, but, while I recognize the vital importance of that subject, I am more concerned in this article to deal with certain other matters. For, apart from changes in the law, much might be done to increase the number of happy marriages, in connexion with which no question of divorce would arise.

The real line of progress must consist, ***firstly***, in such moral education of the young as will really fit them for an adult life, which can never be successful except for those who have known discipline, whether they be married or single. And ***secondly***, in making certain that before they marry men and women are made fully acquainted with the truth about the married state.

There are in the world to-day a certain number of men and women for whom it is impossible to anticipate success in the married relationship. Never having learnt to say no to themselves, they are not in possession of themselves. Being constantly the victims of caprice, or of any passing emotion, they are incapable of following any line of conduct involving continuous self-control. They demand of life that at every turn it shall please them, and when it fails to do so they become petulant and foolish. Profoundly self-centred, they are incapable of any love that involves self-giving. Unfortunately, many of them are possessed of great sex attraction, but when they enter on marriage their marriages are foredoomed. And there is no way of preventing such instances of married misery except the way of securing for all our children a training throughout childhood which shall issue in the power of sustained self-management.

Fortunately, the number of such persons is small, and for the rest there is much that might be done to prepare them for success in marriage. About four points in particular I wish to speak.

First we might offer to the young a consistent and sincere testimony to the effect that the only reason for marriage which gives hope that it may be a success is honest love, and that those who marry without love are degrading both themselves and the estate of matrimony. They degrade themselves because the physical intimacies which follow marriage, while beautiful as the expression of love, are on any other basis unlovely and unpleasant. Women who endure them without love often acquire a deep distaste for them. Men who ask for them except in the name of love are merely using their wives' bodies for their own satisfaction. The ugly phrase 'legalized prostitution' is, unfortunately, all too applicable to such cases. Further, it is beyond question that nothing but love can solve the uncounted little problems which occur daily when two persons live in the intense intimacy which marriage involves. The possibilities of friction and annoyance which the situation presents are so numerous that the really wonderful thing about contemporary society is the large number of couples who surmount them successfully. But they only do it in the power of sincere affection.

Yet marriages without love are very common to-day. The instinct towards marriage is so very strong in women in the later twenties, that thousands of them decide 'to chance it,' though they know that their hearts have not really been touched. Further, family and other influences are often brought to bear upon them to induce them to do so. One of the most unhappy marriage tragedies known to the writer is that of a woman who was urged by her family to a 'suitable marriage,' though her heart was quite untouched. Her clergyman was even enlisted in the matter to tell her that 'a woman's part in life is to sacrifice herself.' And so she yielded, only to meet after a few years the man who was her real counterpart, and who stirred her to the depths. She now finds herself tied to a man to whom she cannot give what he wants, compelled to part from the man for whom her deepest self yearns, and to face for herself a future in which she sees no chance of happiness. While families and even ministers of religion play such parts, the cause of successful marriage is constantly being betrayed.

A second truth that ought to be forcibly urged on the attention of all young people is that mere physical fascination is NOT a sufficient ground for marriage, and affords no real hope of lasting happiness. Strong mutual physical attraction may lead to physical experiences of a very intense and moving kind. But only for a time. Inevitably and ere very long each must face the truth as to what sort of a person the other is. And very often at that point the two discover that they have very little in common. Their tastes may be divergent, and their convictions in violent conflict. Of real mental and moral affinity they may have none, and then each will find it increasingly distasteful to have to remain in the company of the other. I have known a woman who once was simply enraptured, wake up to realize that the man she had married was really, according to her sincere taste, a horrible man. I have known husbands who once were utterly fascinated reach a point at which they unwillingly, but none the less completely, despised the women they had married. In such marriages no happy sense of community in thought and feeling will every now and then lead to a heightened sense of affection. Physical union will not happen as the culmination of a joyful fellowship involving their whole personalities. And so finally physical intimacy will itself become distasteful. Passion may flame up now and then and, carrying them both away, delude them into believing that they are truly united. But inexorably the truth will assert itself. And after that married life will be reduced to a matter of endurance. Nobody who has dealt at first hand with the realities about marriage in the modern world can fail to wish that this truth—perhaps more than any other in the whole field—might be forcibly presented to each rising generation.

A third service that might be rendered by those who desire to increase the number of successful marriages is to make it certain that correct and sufficient knowledge of the technique of married life on its physical side be offered to those who are about to marry. The fact is that in these days large numbers of couples who do sincerely love each other are failing to attain sexual harmony, and are therefore in trouble. That mutual and joyful experience which might unite them and smooth their way is being missed; and in consequence a situation arises in which acute nervous strain is unavoidable. It would seem to have been assumed in Britain that husbands will know by instinct the art of making love, and of leading a woman through that series of emotions which will ultimately enable her to play her part happily in the sacrament of bodily intimacy. But no such assumption is justified. I have known a good many men who, on the threshold of marriage, have assured me that they knew all that they needed to know; but I doubt if I have known one who really did know. The means for acquiring such knowledge have not been available until very lately. The Church has as yet done nothing in the matter, and the books which do offer the necessary knowledge are far from being wholly acceptable from a Christian point of view. So honeymoons continue to be often unhappy experiences, and couples who do truly love each other find only strain, discomfort, and discord in the intimacies of their new life—a bitter and disillusioning experience. Our conspiracy of silence about a permanent and God-ordained feature of our human life has indeed had bitter fruits, and the most bitter of them are often gathered by affectionate and high-minded people who, through ignorance and awkwardness, have failed to achieve mutual adjustment within marriage. The outspoken things which have been written about 'The sin of the Bridegroom' are no doubt often true. But bridegrooms sin chiefly through sheer ignorance of how to play their part, and of how to adjust themselves with delicacy and consideration to a nature very different from their own. How can they help such ignorance in a society where very often there is no one to enlighten them! The Church performs the marriage ceremony and sends couples away with its blessing, but has only in the smallest degree done anything to secure for them a knowledge of the delicate art which they must learn to practise if their marriage is to be a success. It is foolish and prudish to pretend that there is not a physical problem in every marriage, or that its solution is not a matter of vital moment. We incarnate beings cannot live happily or truly in disregard of physical facts, and the effort to do so is not high-minded or spiritual; it is simply foolish. All the people who have had any extensive and first-hand experience of this side of life are agreed that if only true education in the technique of married life were made available to both men and women, a large percentage (probably over 50 per cent.) of divorce cases might be avoided.

And, lastly, it might be explained to all who marry that a successful marriage, like any other great moral and spiritual achievement, is something that must be worked for and that does not create itself. Modern novel-writers never seem to weary of telling stories of married couples who, after a time, discover that there are difficulties inherent in the married relationship, and who, for that reason, break out into denunciations of the institution of marriage. Probably in this respect the novelists quite truly represent modern men and women. Having started with the delusion that within marriage all things OUGHT to go smoothly, and that human life OUGHT to be a happy thing for married people, great numbers of people become angry and bitter when they discover that their assumptions were quite unwarranted. The art of living a successful human life is always a great and difficult one; and though it may be easier for two people who attack the problem together, even for them it cannot be made simple. Married persons have got to create their own happiness by patience, unselfishness, good temper, and, if possible, some humour, or else they will never possess it. It is quite beyond the reach of the impatient, the merely impulsive, or the self-centred. And nothing can alter that inexorable decree.

In particular it would save a vast amount of pain and disappointment if we would all realize that in all departments of our life we are subject to the action of a certain rhythm, or to alternating phases of high and low vitality. This is true of our general reaction to life. We have moods in which we feel we could do anything, and alas, we have others when the plainest tasks seem to intimidate us, and we drag through the hours of the day. It is notoriously true of artists that after periods during which inspiration has been clear and commanding they experience others in which they feel they will never again be able to create. All the literature of spiritual experience bears testimony to the same general truth in connexion with religion. After periods during which the glory of religious truth has been experienced, and in which the wonder of it has lifted the soul to the heights, there come phases of 'dryness,' in which men are tempted to believe they have lost all spiritual capacity—so dead and flat do they find themselves. And the same thing is true in relation to the romantic history of the normal man, and still more so in relation to the normal woman. After the first great hour in which young lovers find each other and confess their love, it is notorious that there often follows another phase during which both are harassed by doubts, and find it very difficult to adjust themselves to their new experience. So also after the first wonderful phase of exhilaration which often delights young married couples, there MUST follow another phase of lowered romantic activity. The man must allow his life occupation to engross much of his time and thought. The woman must find ways of giving scope to her independent personality. Further, the very element of physical feeling which played so large a part in their first happy days of union will assuredly retire into the background. Our creative instincts and desires are subject to fluctuation, and the light of pure romance NEVER burns steadily throughout life. It is in such periods that husbands and wives have to learn to fall back on community of interest, and must develop that solid friendship which has to be the backbone of any lasting marriage. Good lovers have to learn to be good friends. Those who have had intense joy in each other have to learn also to give much to each other, and at times to serve rather than merely enjoy. What was at first a fellowship of a very sacred, private, and exclusive kind must broaden till it becomes a fellowship in facing the whole of life. Otherwise marriage would be a poor and narrowing affair.

And then for those who have been learning loyalty and sympathy in a cooler atmosphere romance will return. The delusion that it belongs only to the first few years of marriage is perhaps the most mischievous one now abroad in the world. It is no such fleeting and capricious power. It returns; and it returns with new power. There is, in fact, an intimacy of communion and a deep joy in the union which marriage means which is possible only to those who are far on in their journey.

To-day a very great many couples miss that consummation in marriage; and they miss it because having entered on marriage either in ignorance or with false anticipations, they allow themselves to be defeated by the problems and strains which are really inherent in the married state.

It may well be said that no amount of mere talking or writing can give people the moral purpose and the constancy of will which alone will carry them through. But though that is true, it is also true that people who know beforehand what they must expect, and who therefore have a chance to prepare themselves for the future, have at least a greatly heightened chance of attaining to success.

The knowledge on which success in marriage may be based IS in the possession of the human race. But we have done sadly little in making it available in time for each generation as it presses on into life.

The Divine intention for men and women is NOT beyond realization by quite ordinary people, but it is essential that life in this respect should be based on knowledge and not on sentimental delusions.

There is a final word which Christ would assuredly have to say to all who enter on marriage. He would say to them that without Divine help in this, as in every other department of life, we 'can do nothing.' He would insist that life on a godless foundation is always life tending towards ruin. He would say that to look to God for His blessing and His guidance is the first essential of all real success in life's greater ventures. Experience constantly endorses this word. The people who fail in marriage are very often just people who are failing in life; and they are failing in life because their spiritual natures are starved. Having found nothing great enough in life to satisfy their Divine natures—having, that is to say, turned from the only communion which could possibly fill them with deep content—they are profoundly unhappy. They may turn to their wives or their husbands, hoping to have their malady cured. But that malady no one can cure for another. Two godless, and therefore unhappy people in one house cannot save each other. Rather because each is inwardly starved and restless they are likely to 'get on each other's nerves' and to blame each other for a weariness which is, in truth, only the result of neglecting God.

The deepest, truest thing which can be said about the secret of success in marriage, is the same thing that has to be said about the secret of success in life. And that secret is that only those who by contact with God have been delivered from self, and released from the small and stuffy house of self-centred living, are able to find life in any great and truly happy sense.

The Purpose of Deuteronomy, Chapter V.

By Professor Adam C. Welch, D.D., New College, Edinburgh.

MODERN commentators, such as Hempel and Steuernagel, differ greatly in their treatment of this chapter. But they all agree in denying its unity and in questioning whether the Decalogue formed an original part of it. Their decision as to the verses which they refer to the original, and those which they count secondary, is largely determined by their respective theories on the function these early chapters were intended to fulfil in connexion with the Code of chs. 12–26 to which they have been prefaced. I suggest that there is need to try a new method of approach to the whole question. And that is to take a section like ch. 5 by itself, and seek to discover whether it shows any purpose in its author. Studied in isolation, it may show itself to be a unity, and to reveal a definite aim.

Only after such careful examination of each section will it be possible to arrive at any clear idea of their relation to each other and to the Code, before which they have been placed.

My contention is that 5^{2-33} (possibly also 6^{1}) is a unity, written to convey a clear judgment on a large issue in Hebrew religion.[1] The writer cast his teaching into the form of a record of certain events which took place at Horeb at the time of the giving of the Law. When he says in v.[3] that Yahweh made a covenant there, not with the fathers, but with us, even all of us, here, alive this day, he is emphasizing that he wishes to refer to an earlier time than that in which the Deuteronomic law was delivered, and to a different place from the east of Jordan. He is not merely differing from $2^{14f.}$, but he is deliberately differing. He wishes it to be recognized that what he has to say deals with the time when Israel received the first revelation of its law. The way in which he differs points to the chapter having been written after the Code was collected, and even after it had been provided with some introduction.

He declares then that at Horeb Yahweh, speaking from the midst of the fire, revealed the Decalogue directly to the people. The terms of the Decalogue are the *d'bhārîm* or 'words,' not 'statutes' and 'judgments': they are final in their content—Yahweh added no more; they are also immutable—Yahweh wrote them on two tables of stone (v.[22]). They are also intended for Israel in all conditions and at all periods. If the people observe them faithfully, it will be well with them and with their children for ever (v.[29]). In connexion with these laws, there is no reference to the land which the people are about to enter.

If Yahweh confined Himself to the Decalogue in His revelation of His will to the people, it was because they were unable to bear more. They begged for one who should stand between them and their God, because they could not bear the strain which such a revelation implied. And it is significant that, so far from any blame being attached to them for their attitude, they are commended for the request, and are bidden see in Moses the divinely appointed intermediary between them and their God. The passage has an obvious connexion with $18^{9ff.}$, where the nation is forbidden to have anything to do with soothsayers of all kinds, because Yahweh has sent and will send continually men belonging to its own faith who will meet this need. The revelation which began at Horeb will never cease. For the prophet (*'îsh Elohim*, 'the man of God') will never fail in Israel. And his task is to continue the revelation which thus came to the people, to see that it is preserved in its original purity, and to decide upon its application. But Israel, which was chosen to become the recipient of a Divine revelation, shall never fail to receive it.

Yet the Decalogue, which had been thus solemnly commanded, was obviously quite unfitted to form the basis of a positive religion. Its purely negative character was enough to make this clear. In it the people were ordered jealously to reserve their worship to Yahweh alone, and in connexion with this worship were forbidden to employ any graven image. But they were not told how they ought to worship Him. The Sabbath law stopped short at forbidding all work on that day, but did not say how men must fill its empty hours. The moral laws concerned themselves merely with the vices which must be avoided. Even the most positive of these laws, which commanded honour to parents, did no more than preserve the family life. In preserving this, it formed the basis on which all further co-operation of a larger kind could be based. But it also needed supplement for a religion which was to guide a nation.

The ten words supply the framework or the necessary conditions within which a positive religion can develop: they do not supply the content of such a religion. They warn men against such things as would make impossible an ethical religion like that of Mosaism, and would prevent it from finding foothold and continuance in the nation. But, having done this, they do no more. For all the positive content of Israel's religion Moses must still provide. Accordingly (v.[31]), he receives from Yahweh full instruction on the Law, the statutes and the judgments.[1] This law contains what is wanting in the ten words, the positive elements which make up the religion of the nation. These appear in their two leading forms, the *ḥuqqîm* or 'statutes,' which guide its cult, and the *mishpāṭîm* or 'judgments,' which determine its social conduct. And these together adequately describe the contents of the Code (chs. 12–16), in which the life of old Israel is regulated according to the principles of its religion. There the people's worship, in sacrifice and festival, in the place where it is offered and the forms by which it is conducted, as well as their social life in its organization under judge and king, in its attitude towards the poor and in its marriage customs, is all to be their own. And it is to be their own, because it is all fulfilled with the peculiar character of their religion.

---

[1] The one exception is v.[5]. As it stands, this forms a long parenthesis, and the Hebrew never liked parentheses. Some one, rather pedantically, took offence at the statement in v.[4] that Yahweh spoke 'face to face' to the nation, a privilege which he found elsewhere reserved to Moses. He therefore thrust in a verse which anticipates what follows in v.[27]. It agrees with that verse in making Moses the intermediary between Yahweh and the people; but, by introducing the statement here, misses the point which the original writer desired to make, viz., that Moses only became such an intermediary because the people were unable to bear the direct revelation from Yahweh.

Here, accordingly, there is mention of the land to which the people are going (vv.[31. 33]). Previously there was nothing said about the land, because the Decalogue was valid for all time and every condition. But the statutes and judgments are designed for Palestine, and are framed to meet the needs and the dangers of the new conditions on which the people are entering. The distinctive life which characterizes Israel has come to them through no mere accident of their history, but is the embodiment of the Divine will to them. And on their loyal maintenance of it depends their future as a people.

The chapter is a unity, and the historical form into which it has been cast is no more than a form. In reality it is an effort to answer certain large questions about the national religion. Did the revelation at Horeb cease then, or does Israel live under a continuous revelation from its God? If the revelation is constant, and if it comes through prophets, are there any limits set to the change these prophets are at liberty to make? And is there a norm which can determine the legitimacy of any such changes? The actual religion practised in Canaan is not the religion practised by the fathers at Horeb. If this had been the case, there would have been no reason for Moses issuing a new law before the entry into the land. The writer is thinking out for his people the relation between these two situations. The religion may not depart from its basis, as an ethical religion, in the ten words.

Clearly, then, the author had the two documents before him, the Code with its statutes and judgments and the Decalogue, for he was seeking to define the relation between them. That makes the chapter comparatively late. But it also shows that the document did not originally stand in the connexion in which it now appears. V.[1], which reads: 'Moses called unto all Israel and said unto them, Hear, O Israel, the statutes and judgments which I speak in your ears this day,' plainly forms an unsuitable preliminary to this far-reaching discussion of the relation between Code and Decalogue. The verse is an effort to fit the chapter into a new connexion. It is possible, on the other hand, that 6[1] was the original conclusion. For the discussion of the relation between Code and Decalogue might naturally end with the statement: 'This then is the commandment, viz. the statutes and judgements which the Lord your God commanded to teach you, that ye might do them in the land whither ye go over to possess it.' In that case ch. 5 may have once formed an introduction to the Code which followed on here. On the other hand, the similarity of 6[1] to 5[1] raises the suspicion that it also is an addition of the editor who was finding a place for a very significant discussion. Then the chapter may once have been an independent document. And the fact that its writer speaks of Code and Decalogue as well-known and recognized guides for his people's religion, and speaks of their relation to one another, suggests at least that he was dealing with something other than an introduction. To determine the question, or at least to hope for an answer, it would be necessary to go wider, to examine other similar chapters and discover their character, and not to decide from one document alone. The difficult question of these preliminary chapters is far too involved and interlocked to admit of a ready answer on a narrow basis. It must remain open whether we have not before us a quantity of religious material, which gathered round the central Code and from which the men to whom we owe the Book in its present form made a selection and preserved it in the shape of introduction. Certainly some of the material which is added at the close points in this direction.

At least it seems certain that, for whatever purpose the chapter was written or whatever place it was intended to occupy, it was composed after the Code had become the recognized guide for the nation's life. The questions with which it deals are such as spring up later in every faith. But further it reveals interesting points of contact with the prophetic teaching. The place the writer gives to prophecy and the way in which he regards it as inevitable in Israel, because Israel is in intimate relation to a self-revealing God, are the convictions of Amos. He could say that Yahweh was not content to give Israel a country: He gave it also prophets to let them know their task there ($2^{9ff.}$). In his judgment the prophet could no more hold his peace when Yahweh had spoken than a man could keep his nerves from twittering at a lion's roar (3^8). And he bade the priest at Bethel recognize that it was hopeless to stop prophecy in Israel by police regulations. For, when Yahweh had a message for Israel, he would find a man to utter it. When He had no one else to send, He sent me. And every one knows where I spring from (7^{14}).

---

[1] Here, with Steuernagel, I follow the LXX and Sam. and omit the 'and' before the Statutes (cf. 6[1]). We have not to deal with three magnitudes, law, statutes, judgments; we have only one, a law which consists of statutes and judgments.

Again, it was Amos who first made the distinction between the religion or morality which makes civilization possible, and the specific religion which Israel practised because it was chosen by Yahweh, and who made both the expression of the revealed will of God. For he saw Yahweh about to judge the nations as well as Israel, and having the right to call both to account. There was a relation of Yahweh to His world which was antecedent to the relation of Israel to Him. It was a relation which involved revelation and therefore judgment. To the writer of this chapter there is a Decalogue which is for all time and all conditions, and there is a religion which makes Israel's glory and life.

To find the author making such use of Amos' ideas on religion naturally raises the question whether there is any other evidence of the source from which the chapter has come. And the first is supplied by the language and by the historical material which has been drawn upon. Here one cannot do better than quote the judgment of Steuernagel in the second edition of his commentary, p. 72; 'In his representation of the situation D^2b (the author to whom Steuernagel ascribes the framework of the Decalogue) depends on the Elohistic account in Ex 19; 20^{18-21}; 24^1, though he leaves certain unessential features aside, while on the other hand he develops in his parenetic interest the ideas brought forward by E.' The writer uses historical material from N. Israelite sources, and has been profoundly influenced by a N. Israelite prophet.

The document also contains a version of the Decalogue, which, while it agrees in essentials with that in Exodus, differs in several minor details. The two derive from a common original, but have been modified somewhere by men who worked independently. Now it is impossible to enter fully here into the debate about the date of the source of the Ten Commandments. But one broad fact stares every student in the face, and demands explanation. How did the Hebrew law come to contain two separate and different versions of one of the fundamental documents of its religion? The natural explanation is that which has accounted for the duplicate narratives in Genesis, which in spite of their difference show evidence of being derived from a common tradition. The narratives of J and E were blended into a single history: the early laws of Judah and Israel were left here in their original integrity.

The gravest difficulty which stands in the way of accepting the Deuteronomic Decalogue as the N. Israelite version is that it contains a law which forbids the use of images. Those who relegate this Decalogue to a post-Exilic date can point to the fact that the Northern kingdom was identified from its beginning with the worship of Jeroboam's golden calves. They ignore, however, that the only voice in the nation, which was raised against this form of worship, was that of Hosea, the leading prophet of the North. It is acknowledged that the same prophet objected to the use of the name Baal for Yahweh, and that his protest was so successful as to lead to the disappearance of names like Ishbaal. His vigorous polemic against the calf-worship is the evidence of a deep-rooted objection to the practice, which found its clearest expression in him. The original form of the first law in the Decalogue may have been content to demand that Israel must reserve its entire allegiance to Yahweh—that is the primary demand in the Code. The law against the use of images will then be an addition directed against this special abuse. For such a development to be made in the original command at the bidding of the prophets will obviously be in entire agreement with the function and authority this chapter gives to the prophets.

Another evidence of the same successful protest is to be found in the story of the erection of the golden calf at Horeb. There the use of such emblems for worship is condemned from the very beginning, precisely as the practice of human sacrifice is repudiated in the great account of Abraham's sacrifice of Isaac. To me it is merely impossible to believe that an account which made Aaron the aider and abettor of the nation in such a deed could ever have been written in Jerusalem after the Exile, or, if it had been written, would ever have been admitted into the sacred literature. The temple authorities, who proudly boasted of a priesthood which derived from Aaron, would no more have written such an account than the Roman Catholic hierarchy, who derived their primacy from St. Peter, would have written an account which related the apostle's apostasy after his ordination. The story of the golden calf must date earlier than the Exile. It must even have been admitted into the combined records of the origins of Israel, J E, before the Return. It is a product of the same protest against the use of images, and its literary affinities are all with E.

The chapter has preserved for us the thought of a man who believed that his religion took its origin in a direct revelation from God at Horeb, but who also knew that it had actually received the positive content of its sacrifices and all its institutions on its settlement in Palestine. He believed that the broad lines of this positive religion, by which he and his people lived, were laid down by Moses on the east of Jordan. When he tried to define the relation between these two events, he was inevitably driven to recognize that the revelation to Israel was progressive. And he believed that the medium of this continuous revelation was the prophetic succession. His doctrine of prophecy has thus certain affinities with the Christian doctrine of the Spirit in the Church. And, as the Code about which he wrote derives from N. Israel, so he belongs to the same kingdom.

Literature.

JEREMIAH.

Mr. Raymond Calkins has furnished us with what he believes, rightly enough, to be a desideratum by presenting an exposition of the Book of *Jeremiah the Prophet*, arranged, so far as possible, in chronological order (Macmillan; 10s. 6d. net). His further aim is to rescue the personality and work of Jeremiah from the obscurity in which the confusion of the traditional order of the book has unfortunately buried them. Though frankly admitting that 'chronology is difficult and always problematical in following the course of Jeremiah's career' (p. 122), he can fairly claim to have succeeded in both the tasks he set himself. He gives us a vivid picture of the man, his times, his struggles with himself, his people, and his God, his seeming failure, and his triumphant vindication at the bar of history. His debt to Peake, Skinner, and George Adam Smith, which is obvious throughout the discussion and which he fully acknowledges, in no way lessens the value of his book, as he has made the material his own; and his discussions of the Confessions of Jeremiah, of his attitude to the Deuteronomic Reform, and of the quality of his patriotism, are not only full of good sense and good judgment, but have their value—especially the discussion of patriotism—for the problems which confront us to-day. Only a sympathetic student of Jeremiah could have given us this book.

It is the more to be regretted that the book is marred by occasional blemishes. Apart from six or seven slips in a page of bibliography, Gillies (on Jeremiah) is spelt throughout the book as Gilles, Qina appears twice as Quina (pp. 36, 70), Gedaliah as Gedeliah (p. 334), Pashhur as Pashhuh (p. 279), A. B. Davidson is twice referred to as A. B. Bruce (pp. 43, 46), and twice the fall of Nineveh is assigned to 607 B.C., instead of, as we now know, 612 (pp. 22, 166). On p. 27 we read, 'Zedekiah was made king after the brief interregnum of Jehoiakim who, after being king for three months, had his eyes put out by the Babylonians,' etc.; but it was Jehoiachin, not Jehoiakim (as Mr. Calkins correctly notes elsewhere, p. 365), who reigned for three months, and it was Zedekiah and not Jehoiachin who was blinded by the Babylonians. In certain places Mr. Calkins is too positive, as when he tells us that Jeremiah, 'like Jesus, was thirty years old' when he began his ministry (p. 75), and more particularly, when he tells us twice (pp. 8, 87 f.) that the prophetic party purposely hid Deuteronomy in the Temple, 'so as to give it added authority.' Many scholars would demur to this statement, and Mr. Calkins would have been better advised to adopt Skinner's view to which he alludes, and which, while offending no prejudice, is intrinsically more reasonable. In the bibliography we miss a reference to Professor Welch's fine study of Jeremiah, from which Mr. Calkin's own study would have profited. But, apart from these strictures, it may justly be said that Mr. Calkins has given us a thoroughly useful book, from which preachers especially might derive much fruitful suggestion in preparing a course of sermons on the man whom Mr. Calkins describes as 'in many respects, the greatest of the prophets.'

THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND.

A sense of bewilderment will surely come to those who read *My Hopes and Fears for the Church*, edited by the Very Rev. H. R. L. Sheppard, Dean of Canterbury (Murray; 7s. 6d. net). The book is a symposium, to which men of various schools have contributed. There are some of decided liberal tendencies like Dr. Sheppard himself, others as decidedly Anglo-Catholic, and others who may be called middle-men. Among the best known names are the Rev. F. S. M. Bennett, Dean of Chester, Canon Quick, Dr. F. R. Barry, Dr. Raven, Dr. J. K. Mozley, and Canon Woods. Distinguished as these men are, we should greatly have liked to hear others who, for various reasons, were unable to respond to Dr. Sheppard's invitation, such as Dean Inge, Dr. Major, Dr. Streeter, and Mr. Sidney Dark. The bewilderment we spoke of will be caused by the extraordinary diversity of the views expressed. 'There are, it may be, so many voices in this world,' says St. Paul, 'and none of them is without signification.' And that is true of the writers of this volume. They are all significant, but in what diverse ways!

All the contributors have their weather-eye on the coming Conference at Canterbury, and while they all humbly repudiate the very idea of giving advice to the bishops, they at once proceed to do so in no uncertain fashion. One thinks liberty of thought the great need of the Church of England; another, spiritual revival; and several a broader basis for the Church which will leave the door wide open to Free Churchmen. The 'Bridge' conception of the English Church is often employed, and Dr. Parsons (his is perhaps the very best of all the essays) suggests that the end of the bridge facing the Nonconformists ought to be attended to at once. But the Anglo-Catholics point out that nobody lives on a bridge, but only on the land at each end. Moreover, the Anglo-Catholics want toleration that will include them, but they carefully eschew any discussion of interchange of ministries, and do not even mention the South Indian proposal which figures in nearly all the other essays. Reunion, indeed, is discussed by almost all the writers, but with quite opposite policies frequently. Canon Mozley seems to have altogether given up hope of reunion with the Free Churches, but in this frank statement he stands nearly alone.

What is the upshot? As impartial commentators we should say that two impressions are left on the mind by this extraordinary book. One is that the Church of England is marvellously comprehensive to include such opposites. It is a pity it cannot be even more so and include a little more! The other is that any hope of real reunion between the English Church and the Free Churches seems utterly remote. The Anglo-Catholics advocate a federation of churches, but they would not remain in a Church which recognized Free Church orders. Our conclusion may be pessimistic, and the future may hold something better than this volume promises. But at any rate, when you listen to these discordant voices, you are apt to see only the clouds in the sky.

A STUDY IN SCIENTIFIC THEOLOGY.

The Rev. E. O. James, Ph.D., D.Litt., Vicar of St. Thomas's, Oxford, who has recently published *The Christian Faith in the Modern World* (Mowbray; 7s. 6d. net), is well known as an expert writer on anthropology and folklore. In this new work he seeks to place before the student and the general reader a brief account of the Christian Faith, presented in loyalty to the revelation that has been given in the past, and at the same time in conformity with the new knowledge of the present age. His chapters deal successively with the physical universe, the evolutionary process, the Old Testament, the New Testament, the Incarnation, sin, and redemption, resurrection and immortality, the Church and the ministry, the origins of the sacraments, magic and religion, the saints and the supernatural, the last-named considering in particular the doctrine of the invocation of saints.

All the chapters are informative, and indeed some of them are so close-packed with information that they are apt to lose coherence in places. Less attention to the historical and more to the positive would have enabled Dr. James to give us a more valuable book. As it is, we have here a prolegomena rather than a substantial contribution to scientific theology. But while we say this, we are grateful to him for what he has given us. The matter is fresh and up to date, and very useful lists of relevant books are appended to each of the chapters.

It would appear that Dr. James asks to be regarded as an exponent of liberal orthodoxy or critical catholicism. Either phrase suits him well.

He is obviously in general sympathy with the writers who contributed to 'Essays Catholic and Critical.' But in view of his pronounced ecclesiastical sympathies we should be inclined to interpolate 'Anglican' between liberal and orthodoxy, or between critical and catholicism.

Dr. James offers us some reflections in his concluding chapter, entitled 'The Christian Faith and the Modern World,' on the question whether historic Christianity, and institutional religion generally, will survive the dissemination in the new age of what Jung calls 'directed thinking,' as distinguished from 'phantasy thinking.' It is his belief that the ancient Creeds of the united Church represent the best statements of the permanent Faith of Christendom, and that this Faith is independent of any particular philosophy or world-view; but that nevertheless a reconsideration and restatement of the terms of the permanent elements enshrined in the older categories of thought are imperative requirements of the age. This is the 'liberal orthodox' position, and it is well expressed in these words: 'The tendency of Protestant Liberalism is to break away from the religious experience of historic Christianity, whereas the Liberal Catholic takes his stand upon the fundamental beliefs of Christendom as set forth authoritatively by the whole Church at Nicæa and Chalcedon, employing the methods now current in the learned world to interpret in the light of fuller knowledge the Faith as it has been received throughout the ages.' From such a standpoint the Nicene Creed and the Chalcedonian definition are 'the lowest common multiple of belief' in a reunited Church.

A THEOLOGICAL THRILLER.

A story used to be current about what happened in the course of a well-known heresy case in Scotland some thirty years ago. The heretic, who had written a book that aroused much dissatisfaction, was tried before the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland. In a committee room his counsel and supporters were gathered for consultation, and the counsel (a famous advocate) turning to the accused, said: 'Mr. Blank, I do not quite understand your views on the Resurrection. Do you believe that Christ rose from the dead?' To which the accused replied: 'I believe His *spirit* rose.' Whereupon the famous lawyer turned upon him with, 'And who on earth ever heard of a spirit being buried?' Only he did not say 'on earth.' That irritated outburst expresses fairly well the feeling of many people when they hear that, while the physical resurrection is not true, there was a spiritual resurrection. All the evidence we have, they conclude, is evidence for a physical resurrection and no other kind. And they find it impossible to get over one obstinate fact—the empty tomb.

This conclusion has been immensely fortified by one of the most remarkable books that have appeared for many years—*Who Moved the Stone?*—by Mr. Frank Morison (Faber & Faber; 6s. net). When it is sufficiently advertised it will certainly be one of the best sellers of this or many other years. We have not read any book for long that rivals it in sheer absorbing fascination. Who the author is we do not know. From the close texture of his argument and his relentless logic we should not be surprised to learn that he is a successful lawyer. If not, he ought to be! Probably the most outstanding feature of his book is the vividness of his narrative. You are carried on with breathless interest from point to point, and you actually *see* many of the incidents in the Gospels as if you had been present. But as soon as one has said that, one questions whether another feature is not more prominent, the tenacious grip of realities and the piercing vision into their significance.

Mr. Morison set out years ago to write a book on 'Jesus: The Last Phase' which would dispose of the supernatural aspects of the story. But as he pondered it, and searched into the evidence, it convinced him against his will of the contrary conclusion. And so that book was never written, and this one shaped itself in his mind in its place. It may seem a strong thing to say, but the impression left on the mind after two readings of the book is that it has settled the question so far as mere argument and evidence can do so.

Among other things, one of the main features of Mr. Morison's treatment is his perception and use of what he calls 'submerged facts.' As an instance there is the fact that, if the tomb was not empty, all the agitation and conflict of ideas were conducted in the actual and physical presence of the remains of Jesus. And not only so, but the disciples came with their assertion of Christ's resurrection into the very city where it could have been disproved, where any one could have gone between supper and bedtime and found definite confutation. Moreover, if Jesus still lay in His tomb, why (asks the writer) did it not become a focus for devotion? Why was it never visited? Why did it sink into oblivion? We have given this as an example of the extraordinary insight of the author into facts that lie beneath the surface. But it would be impossible to summarize the argument itself, so closely woven is it. It is enough to say that the whole process of events, from the arrest of Jesus, through His trial to His resurrection, is set before the reader with a power, a picturesqueness, and a thrill that make the book rival in interest a detective novel. Yet the tone and spirit are all the time deeply serious, and one receives the impression that the author is a searcher for truth at all costs. We may end by expressing the hope that after a time, when the book has passed through its inevitable editions, it may be possible to issue it at a price cheap enough to send it broadcast through the land.

PSYCHOLOGY AND THE TRINITY.

An argument for the Trinity has frequently been based on the three constituent elements of personality—Thought, Will, and Feeling—but nowhere has it been worked out so fully and suggestively as it is by the Rev. Hubert M. Foston, D.Lit. (Lond.), in his new work *Man and the Image of God* (Macmillan ; 7s. 6d. net). Some time ago Dr. Foston published an interesting book, 'The Evening of the Last Supper' (1928), in which it was urged that the gospel narratives must be studied from the biological standpoint as well as from that of purely literary criticism, inasmuch as the documents imply a living process. The suggestion gave the reviewers no little trouble, and it is useful to recall this because the same gift for tracing subtle analogies finds fuller scope in the new volume. Dr. Foston first studies the psychological process of perception, and argues that the ideas of 'manifestation,' 'presentation,' and 'intelligibility' are precisely those brought before us in the Person of the Son, who is described in the New Testament by such terms as 'image' and 'word.' In the same way the conative process of attention and the experience of feeling have their counterparts in the activities of the Spirit and of the Father respectively. The inseparable relations between the cognitive, conative, and affective processes are also exemplified in the unity of the Triune Persons.

This is an impressive argument, but Dr. Foston carries the analogy further. The New Testament views the natural creation as coming into being through the Son ; it is therefore all the more striking to note parallels between the 'products' of our intellectual life—percepts, images, and reasoned thoughts—and the natural phenomena present in the vegetable, animal, and human worlds. The analogies are significant when we read that the Creative Word 'was life' and that 'the life was the light of men.' Again, the existence of self-conscious thinking in the intellectual scale awakens the expectation in the cosmic scale of 'some fundamental triune form of Reality, underlying all nature, as the triunity of mind underlies all intellectual organization and development,' and it is surely 'a most extraordinary fact' that the doctrine of the Trinity was formulated before such a comparison was worked out.

This last point precludes the explanation of the Trinity as a matter of mental projection. 'In actual history the declaration of the Trinity in the form of a revelation came *first* ; and now afterwards the natural facts are seen in a complex way to corroborate it.' The argument is thus not merely one of analogy, but 'the confirmation of old-standing definite statement through a network of afterwards recognised facts.' 'Nature and mind together are so shaped as to hold a niche uniquely for the doctrine of the Trinity' (p. 141). Christian thoughts which possess such a 'balanced ultimacy' cannot be the accidents of theological vagary, and the bearing of such considerations is to raise again questions which may have been dismissed in too much haste.

This bare outline will, perhaps, serve to indicate the rich suggestiveness of Dr. Foston's fine book, but no summary can do justice to the manner in which he develops his thoughts. He delights to hold them up to the light, and asks you to look at them from as many angles as possible. If an objection or a difficulty is raised, he will track it down and reveal some unsuspected positive suggestion in it, and everywhere his argument is illuminated by striking illustrations from natural science, astronomy, and philosophy. In some ways the most difficult, but certainly the profoundest, part of the discussion is the chapter on 'The Likeness of Love in the Universe,' where Dr. Foston seeks to show that all the ranges of Nature seem to point as their climax to a participation in the likeness of God as Love. Self-sufficient in appearance, the universe finds its principle of harmonization beyond itself and only in God.

PAGAN AFRICA.

The Evangelization of Pagan Africa, by Professor J. Du Plessis, Litt.D., D.D. (Juta & Co., Cape Town ; Walker Bros., London ; 16s.), is a most painstaking and meritorious work. The field covered is not so wide as the title would perhaps suggest. Africa may be divided into two nearly equal portions by a line drawn from the mouth of the Niger to the southern extremity of the Red Sea. North of that line we have, broadly speaking, Muhammadan Africa, south of that line Pagan Africa. The present work deals only with the latter. Still further, its scope is limited by the fact that in a previous volume Professor Du Plessis has dealt with 'Christian Missions in South Africa.' Consequently he here confines himself to mission work in West, Central, and East Africa. His treatment of the subject is characterized by great accuracy and fullness of detail. No other work can be named which covers the ground so adequately. Book I., which is devoted to a history of 'the age of discovery' and the slave trade, though most interesting, seems unnecessarily full. On the other hand, the failure to make any but passing references to Livingstone's travels in Central Africa is a grave omission, even though his work may have been treated in a previous volume. The author complains of unavoidable delay in the publication of his book, and there are evidences here and there that his narrative has not been brought quite up to date, particularly in regard to the work done in German mission fields since the War. The fact remains, however, that here we have a work of outstanding merit and of real historical value, a work which should find a place in every missionary library.

THE DEVOTIONAL COMMENTARY.

The Rev. Professor C. V. Pilcher, D.D., of Wycliffe College, Toronto, was set a hard task when he was invited to contribute to the R.T.S. Devotional Commentary on the Bible edited by the Rev. C. H. Irwin, D.D., the volume on *Hosea, Joel, Amos* (R.T.S.; 3s. 6d. net). The devotional mind can play more readily on a book like the Psalms than on the historical or prophetical books; and when to the difficulties inherent in the nature of the material is added, in the case of Hosea at any rate, the peculiarly perplexing nature of the text, the real magnitude of Dr. Pilcher's task will be appreciated. In our judgment he has solved his problem with complete success by reducing the purely devotional comment to a minimum. He has wisely chosen to present as vividly as possible the prophets and their messages rather than to talk piously about them, in the confidence that what *they* say, when we understand it, is more effective than anything that *we* can say by way of exposition or elaboration.

Dr. Pilcher offers a translation of the three prophets assigned to him, a translation which obviously rests on real knowledge and scholarship, as does also the brief exposition which follows. The short chapters are prefaced by titles which, while bright and attractive, are really suggestive and never sensational; for example, Israel's Indian Summer, King-Makers and King-Murderers (Hos 7^{4-7}), The Fear of the Dark (Am 6). The writer is obviously well acquainted with Sellin's work, and, reading between the lines, one can easily see that he is abreast of contemporary literature on the Old Testament. The result is a commentary which is devotional in the best sense, because it respects the facts of history and criticism as well as the facts of sin, judgment, mercy, and God.

HAUNTING YEARS.

The public conscience has been stirred to revolt against recent books about the men who gave their lives to win the war. We have raised monuments of every kind in their honour; yet the famous war correspondent Sir Philip Gibbs has been moved to ask, 'When we stand bareheaded in the Two Minutes' Silence are we honouring the men whose courage was due to excess of alcohol, who lost all moral discipline in France and Flanders and were drunkards and debauchees behind the lines?' He protests emphatically that this is a slander and a libel upon the army of our youth who left these shores for the most desperate ordeal men have ever faced. At such a time we are glad to welcome another first-hand testimony to the same effect in a volume *Haunting Years: The Commentaries of a War Territorial*, by W. Linton Andrews, now the distinguished editor of 'The Leeds Mercury' (Hutchinson; 7s. 6d. net).

Mr. Andrews, though a Yorkshireman, was on the editorial staff of a Dundee paper when the war broke out, and at once he joined the territorial battalion of the famous Black Watch and served with it on the Western Front for three most eventful years before coming home to train for an officer's commission. This is the faithful, frank, unvarnished tale of a ranker, the unconsciously self-drawn portrait of a true Christian soldier, encouraging the weak and frightened, standing out against injustice and doing the hateful job of fighting in the spirit of a crusader. 'Remember,' he writes, 'this is not my own story alone: it is the story of many thousands of others. We did not go into battle like the brute beasts that perish, like sheep going to the slaughter, but in what might be our last hours thought very tenderly of those at home.' Mr. Andrews has the gift of terse and vivid narrative. He takes his reader with him into the trenches and makes him realize in some measure the unspeakable horrors of that kind of warfare. It is clear that he had the fine gift of comradeship. Nothing shows this better than his tributes to the officers under whom and the men with whom he counts it an abiding honour to have served.

Those who have the responsibility of leading the devotions of worshippers in the sanctuary need all the help they can get, especially in churches where 'free prayer' is the rule. For these *When Praying in the Holy Place*, by the Rev. George Blair, B.D. (Allenson; 6s. net), will be a real boon. Mr. Blair has collected a series of prayers which he has written and used himself in the course of his ministry. To these he has added a number of complete Communion services, prayers for special occasions and orders for the chief Church festivals. We have nothing but praise for this excellent manual—at least almost nothing. Our one criticism is that many of the prayers are too long. But even this has an advantage, as it increases the amount of material to be drawn upon. There is little that is liturgical in these devotions, but they are good examples of the best kind of unwritten prayers characteristic of the freer sort of service.

The Life of our Lord, by Mr. Reginald G. Ponsonby (Bell; 3s. 6d. net), is a harmony compiled from the four Gospels in such a way as to present one continuous narrative. Where any episode is narrated by more than one Evangelist, Mr. Ponsonby takes the fullest account and supplements it by the narratives of the other Evangelists when they give additional information or add some graphic touch. No doubt this procedure is open to critical objections, and as a matter of fact it leads to rather odd results, as when, for example, the Lukan Preface is immediately followed by the Johannine Prologue; but the result as a whole is to give a readable and vivid narrative which cannot fail to arrest the attention. Without comment or explanation the text is left to speak for itself, but at the end of the book a few additional notes, a table of parallel sections, a list of parallel passages, and a useful map are given. An interesting Preface to the work is given by Sir Wilfred Grenfell, who points out that 'Youth, in the hustle of these days, needs increasingly just what this book attempts to afford,' and tells us that the compiler is a layman, of a brilliant mind, who for several years has worked with the object of meeting that need. With Sir Wilfred we wish the book every success and a place 'not merely in every wise man's library, but on every earnest man's table.'

We have pleasure in calling the attention of our readers to the appearance of the second edition of the Rev. W. L. Paige Cox's valuable and timely discussion of *The Heavenly Priesthood of our Lord* (Blackwell; 1s. net), on the first edition of which we commented favourably some months ago. It is a reasoned and scholarly protest against the widely disseminated doctrine that 'Christ is continually offering Himself to the Father, and that the Sacrament of the Holy Communion is the earthly counterpart of that offering.' This discussion, temperate as it is, has evoked indignant and abusive criticism from those against whose view Mr. Cox has so convincingly argued, and this criticism he answers in a carefully written appendix, in which he takes the opportunity to develop his argument further. The original pamphlet created no little stir, and apparently the writer has the support of some of the best scholars in the Church; and he seems to us to have the New Testament on his side—which is of much more importance.

Who Wrote the Fourth Gospel? is a résumé of the positive evidence for the Apostolic authorship, published by the Board of Religious Education of the Presbyterian Church of Australia. Its author, the Rev. Alexander Yule, M.A., of Balwyn, Melbourne, hopes that his restatement of the evidence will lead earnest inquirers to the same overwhelming conviction which lights up his own mind and gladdens his heart. The main stress of the argument lies on the external evidence and the witness of the Gospel itself to the fact that it is the work of a Palestinian Jew and an Apostolic eye-witness. The best chapter is that which discusses, and rejects, the alleged testimony of Philip of Side to the martyrdom of the Apostle. Mr. Yule adopts the view that the well-known quotation from Papias given by Eusebius does not imply the existence of 'two Johns.' 'Personally,' he says, 'I must class "John the Presbyter" with the famous Mrs. Harris of *Martin Chuzzlewit*. I find it increasingly difficult to suppose that there was any "sich a person."' The argument of the pamphlet is spirited and well informed, but it does not fully come to grips with the objections to the Apostolic authorship, and fails to consider the alternative view that the Gospel may rest on the tradition of John without actually being the product of his pen.

Many years ago a booklet, *The Babylonian Story of the Deluge and the Epic of Gilgamish,* was written by Sir E. A. Wallis Budge, the late Keeper of Assyrian Antiquities in the British Museum. As there has been a considerable advance in our knowledge of Babylonian matters since then, the brochure has been revised by Mr. C. J. Gadd, the Assistant-Keeper in the Department, and it is now re-issued under the same title (Trustees of the British Museum; 1s. 6d. net). An excellent account is first given of the Royal Libraries at Nineveh, with specimens of the tablets in cuneiform. The twelve tablets of the Gilgamish Epic are next described and summarized, and the Legend of the Deluge, as contained on the eleventh one, is given, both in the original and in an English translation. The version of the Legend according to Berosus is also rendered in full translation for purposes of comparison. Apart from the Gilgamish Epic, it is shown that other versions or recensions of the Deluge Legend existed both in Sumerian and Babylonian as early as 2000 B.C., such as those published by Scheil and Poebel. The theory, no doubt correct, is advanced that the original event commemorated in the Legend was 'a serious and prolonged inundation or flood in and over Babylonia, which was accompanied by great loss of life and destruction of property.' Altogether the brochure is an excellent and welcome compendium of information of an authoritative nature, and should be of deep interest, not only to Old Testament students, but to the general reader.

Here is a live book upon vital subjects, packed with the kind of facts that one is always wanting and has not lying to his hand—*The Dawning Epoch,* by the Rev. Archibald Chisholm, D.Litt. (James Clarke; 3s. 6d. net).

It consists of a series of studies on the big questions of the hour. The Future of Western Civilization faces the difficulties of the time with a bold hope, built not a little upon knowledge of former crises thought in their day to be the end. The Foundations of World Peace—lucid and well informed; The Reform of the Stock Exchange—sane where much sheer unreason is too often chattered; Expenditure and Social Well-Being, starting from the despondency with which many, who a little while ago were quite confident that they had found the long-desired solution of the world's problem, are now regarding their old theories with doubtful eyes—among them one notices State Socialism is included; Christian Principles in Industry, and what is being attempted; and the Witness of Protestantism—make up a set of fresh and informing chapters that rush us on to an almost abrupt end.

Those who watch the issue of current theological literature must have been struck by the intensity and strength of the Roman Catholic propaganda. The same observant persons must have been rather surprised to find so little of a contrary nature from the Protestant side. This lack is supplied, so far as one book can do it, by an excellent volume, *Inside the Roman Church,* by One who was There, Mr. J. W. Poynter, formerly a prominent Roman Catholic writer (Epworth Press; 3s. 6d. net). This is a powerful examination of Roman Catholic claims. And the impression it produces is intensified by the obvious fairness and restraint with which the writer conducts his investigation. All the main positions are scrutinized—the claim to Papal infallibility, the Roman doctrine of the Sacraments, and all the rest—and they are dealt with calmly and with relentless logic. The book is not fanatical or prejudiced. The author was for years a Roman, and it was his honest examination of the evidence for the purpose of answering Protestant objections that convinced him of the instability of the Roman case. This volume deserves a wide circulation and a careful consideration.

Mr. H. E. Bryant, B.A., formerly Headmaster of Brigg Grammar School, is much to be congratulated on his competent translation of 2 Cor. in *New Light on an Old Letter* (Epworth Press; 8d.). The translation is based almost entirely on the Greek text of Westcott and Hort, and is not only a close modern rendering, but a piece of good English as well. Where Mr. Bryant finds it necessary to make a paraphrase, or to introduce an explanatory phrase, he gives the reason in a footnote and often adds a more literal translation. An excellent brief Introduction describes the character of the Epistle and the circumstances of its composition. Reference is also made to the 'painful letter' probably embodied in 10–13^{10}, and to the earlier fragment in 6^{14}–7^{1}. The translation would form an excellent guide for a Study Circle, and the individual reader will find it an interesting and valuable help to the understanding of what Mr. Bryant justly describes as 'the most self-revealing' of St. Paul's letters.

We are now favoured with volume iii. of the *Excavations at Kish* (Geuthner, Paris; 60 fr.).

Volume ii. has meantime been delayed, but the present volume contains the results of the expedition to Mesopotamia in 1925–27, undertaken by the Herbert Weld archæologists from the University of Oxford and those from the Field Museum of Natural History in Chicago. The account of the excavations is presented by L. Ch. Watelin, and the epigraphical notes and selection of contracts are given by Professor Langdon of Oxford, the Director of the expedition. It was during the next expedition (the sixth) that the enormous age of the site at Kish was revealed, and that the chief period of Sumerian civilization was found to be pre-diluvian. For below the red stratum, right beneath the wide excavations, lies a layer of sand deposited by a great flood, and from there, through a layer twenty feet thick to water-level, the excavators came across the brick tombs of the mighty men of Kish, dating from at least 5000 B.C. It is clear that the huge ruins of Kish, scattered over an area of five miles long, contain secrets of the utmost importance, and future researches will be awaited with much interest. The volume is enriched with numerous plates, and also copies of the cuneiform tablets unearthed. It is beautifully printed and well finished, and the Parisian publishers deserve much credit for the production.

Since the publication of Dr. Rawlinson's 'St. Mark' we have had an expectant and admiring mind about him. His little book, *The Church of England and the Church of Christ* (Longmans ; 5s. net), is not a great achievement, but it exhibits his best qualities—sound scholarship, tolerance, and a real concern about the best things. There are four chapters: one on 'The Church of Christ,' another on 'The Church of England,' a third on 'Movements and Tendencies within the Church,' and the last on 'The Anglican Church and the Future.' Dr. Rawlinson writes with appreciation of all the 'Movements' that can be called Christian, and shows that in many ways they have something to contribute to the common stock. But the things he has to say are mainly about the Anglican Church. He is very definite in his rejection of Roman errors ; quite severe, also, in his rebuke of extremists of all kinds in his own Church. But he both loves and admires his Church, and much of his concluding chapter is devoted to an earnest plea for the improvement of its resources. He specially urges the better education of the clergy, of whose average intellectual gifts he does not seem to cherish an unqualified admiration. Members of the Church of England will do well to heed the warnings and exhortations the author addresses to them. And others who wish to know what a broad and cultured Christian mind thinks of 'these discontents' will find it recorded with a certain sweet and humble firmness here.

Richard Rolle is, of course, a notable figure in English literature and religion. And it is well to have a selection of his writings in a handy form—*Richard Rolle, Selected Works* (Longmans ; 8s. 6d. net). There is a competent introduction, somewhat marred by a rather querulous spirit towards other people than its subject, and a couple of hundred pages of selections, occasionally lit by a flash of something like genius. But, on the whole, Rolle is not among the greatest, and can be even dull.

There was a time when the essay was a favourite form of literature. Many of us remember the joy of Stevenson's books, and further back of Hazlitt and Lamb. To-day a blight seems to have fallen on this kind of writing. There are few essayists of the old manner, and that is our loss. But occasionally one comes along, and we may hail him with a sincere welcome. *Without Prejudice*, by Mr. S. G. Dunn (Luzac ; 3s. 6d. net), reveals much of the real art of the essayist. It is genial and wise and penetrating, and whether the writer is dealing with dreams, or 'being oneself,' or 'living a double life,' or 'taking the road,' or 'the case against spiritualism,' he has always something shrewd and wise to say, and says it in graceful and suggestive words. The book will give pleasure, and, it may be hoped, not a little profit, to those who love to reflect on life and to read the reflections of a thoughtful and discerning mind.

In *George of Lydda, the Patron Saint of England* (Luzac ; 12s. net), by Sir E. A. Wallis Budge, the late Keeper of Assyrian and Egyptian Antiquities in the British Museum, we have a study of the cultus of St. George in Ethiopia, along with thirteen plates, an introduction, and translations of the Ethiopic texts found in the manuscripts from Makdalâ. Since the early eighties of last century it has been realized that the Oriental Versions of the history and martyrdom of George of Lydda are the sources of the western stories and afford us the correct knowledge of his life. On this account, the present volume, containing the full text of the Ethiopic Version, supplies an undoubted want. It gives the narrative of St. George's martyrdom, a short history of the founding of the Church and Shrine of St. George at Lydda, and the long encomium on him by Bishop Theodotus. All the evidence available, as the volume shows, tends to prove that the legend of St. George in its oldest form contains the story of the life and death of a Christian martyr, which was written for the instruction of Christians. On this story were grafted portions of legends of gods and heroes and supernatural beings, and much of the original form of the legend was destroyed in the process. St. George fought no dragon, but as the Hero of Christendom, the scribes were obliged to invent one for him. The book forms volume xx. of Luzac's 'Semitic Text and Translation' Series, but a few copies may be had without the Ethiopic text. No one could have done the work better than Sir Wallis Budge, who has specialized in such matters, and the book deserves a wide circulation among all interested in the early growth of Christianity.

Professor Richard M. Vaughan of Newton Theological Seminary believes that 'no aspect of modern life is more significant than the increasing recognition of personality.' In this persuasion he has written a most interesting and valuable work, *The Significance of Personality* (Macmillan; 10s. 6d. net), in which the idea is taken as a principle of interpretation, in the conviction that it makes possible a world view which best meets the demands of philosophy, religion, and ethics. Personality is presented as the clue to the doctrines of God and Man, the Incarnation and the Atonement, to the experiences of Forgiveness, Faith, and Renewal, and to the problems of Immortality and Certainty in Religion. This is obviously an ambitious project. Professor Vaughan pursues his aim with a very great measure of success, although its price appears to be a modal interpretation of the Trinity and an immanental view of the Person of Christ. From beginning to end, the book is full of striking and arresting thoughts. The illustrations are apt and numerous; the style is clear and incisive, and the essays are well sprinkled with the pleasing salt of epigram. Wide as the range of subject-matter is, the interest is sustained throughout, and it is impossible to read the book without being moved and even excited. Not the least attractive feature is its reasoned optimism. Professor Vaughan believes, and makes us believe, that 'the great days of the church are ahead,' and that 'the signs are multiplying that a Wind from heaven is moving with fresh power upon the hearts of men in all lands.'

In *The Origins of the Druze People and Religion* (Milford; 10s. 6d. net), by Professor Philip K. Hitti, Ph.D., of Princeton University (formerly of the American University of Beirut), which makes volume xxviii. of the 'Columbia University Oriental Studies,' we have a competent attempt made to solve the riddle of this strange national-religious body, which has lived for about nine hundred years in Syria. Various theories have been advanced to account for their peculiar doctrines and customs, but they have always remained the great mystery of the Lebanon mountains. Dr. Hitti was born in the Lebanon, and Arabic is his native tongue. As a boy and a young man he associated with the Druzes, and still has access to their literature. On this account he is probably better fitted than any other scholar to solve the enigma as to who they are and what they believe. The study of this book is especially valuable and interesting because of the historical connexion of Druzism with Christianity and eastern Christian sects. In its development, Druzism became heir to a number of Zoroastrian and Judæo-Christian tenets, as well as to a body of Hellenistic and Persian philosophy. The basic fundamentals of Druze theology are, therefore, paralleled by corresponding Christian dogmas. In this way, as the author shows, there is after all nothing very mysterious in the 'Asian mystery,' and the 'great enigma' lends itself to solution. The book contains extracts and facsimiles from the Druze sacred writings, together with a map and index.

The last half-century has witnessed a great revival of interest in the life and work of John Wyclif, the translator of the Bible. The interest has been characterized by the historical and critical spirit of the age, which endeavours to place the outstanding men of the past in their own background. Professor S. Harrison Thomson, Ph.D., B.Litt., of the California Institute of Technology, has rendered an excellent service to Wyclif by publishing the latter's *Summa de Ente*, Book I., the First and Second Tractates, with critical notes and introduction, from the two extant manuscripts (Milford; 10s. 6d. net). We have already had no less than thirty-five of the great reformer's Latin works published under the distinguished auspices of the Wyclif Society (dissolved in 1924), but a large quantity of his writings still remains to be edited. Unfortunately, some of them are lost, but the *Summa de Ente* has been preserved complete; and in the introduction to the present edition of the first two tractates (which are now edited for the first time), Professor Thomson lays Wyclif's philosophy before the interested reader, explaining what the reformer meant by such fundamental concepts as Being and Existence, and giving an outline of the argument. Like the valuable works on Wyclif by Professor Gotthard Lechler and those of the Wyclif Society, the present volume shows a high level of excellence and sheds much light on Wyclif's processes of thought and his development from schoolman to reformer.

We extend to Mr. F. H. Wales's translation of *The Psalms, Book IV.* (Milford; 1s. net), the same cordial welcome as we have already extended to his translations of the first three books. It is characterized by the same scholarship and the same sensitiveness to the music of words. His deviations from the traditional text, which in this book are not many, are justified either by the textual facts or by reasonable textual conjectures; for example, Ps 100[3], 'He hath made us, and *His we are*' (so substantially R.V.) is unquestionably correct, as against A.V. 'and not we ourselves.' So 'we bring our years to an end *as a breath*' (90[9]) is much more accurate than 'as a tale that is told'; but 'as a murmur' or 'sigh' would have been better still. There are points at which we should differ from Mr. Wales; for example, the LXX and the demonological implications of Ps 90 incline us to prefer 'the pest or *the demon of noon*' in v.[6] to 'the woe that wasteth at noon.' Also in 104[26] the nature of the context and the parallelism seem to justify the emendation of 'ships' into 'sea-monsters,' and in the poetic account of creation (104[8]) 'mountain rose, valleys sank down'—though this involves the transposition of v.[8] and v.[9]—seems preferable to 'they go up the hills, they go down the vales.' But these and similar points are largely matters of opinion, and possibly Mr. Wales does well to err on the conservative side. Among the many felicities of language may be noted his rendering of 106[24], 'they disdained the land of delight.'

A book of popular apologetic which will be helpful in orthodox Anglican circles has been written by the Rev. Ernest Evans, B.D., and published by John Murray, *A Reason for the Faith: Offered to the Young Men and Women of England* (5s. net). The standpoint is that of definite and complete orthodoxy, tempered a little by a somewhat broader view of Scripture. The writer believes that 'truth of doctrine and the gift of the Holy Ghost, by which the exercise of the ministry is possible, come from above, not from below, being derived from the Apostles, who received them from Christ Himself.' There is either a lack of candour or of scholarship in the statement, 'It is not clearly established that Bishops and Presbyters were different Orders, though the balance of probability is in favour of that opinion,' and in the other statement, that we cannot say that Paul ever considered it certain that the end would come in his days. There are some quaint views here and there, as that the baptismal service is the only service at which an unbaptized person may be present, or, again, in the suggestion that, though the consummation of all things is greatly to be desired, yet out of consideration for those who are not ready, God is delaying the accomplishment of it. But on the whole this is an earnest and able attempt to present the Catholic faith in a fashion acceptable to the mind of teachable youth.

Helps to teachers of all kinds are coming constantly from the press, and they are all welcome, for teachers cannot have too much assistance, provided it is based on experience and training. *Hints to Teachers*; Talks on Sunday School Teaching, by Mr. J. T. Newton (National Sunday School Union; 2s. net), has its own merits. The chapters are perhaps too brief; no subject is pursued far enough; but the counsel given is for the most part sound, and the points selected show that the counsel comes from one who has teaching experience behind him. There are nineteen chapters, which include a good deal of mild psychology, but also shrewd 'tips' about the preparation of lessons, the use of maps, story-telling, and other topics. The treatment is suggestive, and if the teacher 'asks for more' he will at least be set off thinking on reasonable lines.

The Rev. J. Garrow Duncan, B.D., who has rendered long and conspicuous service to the archæology of Palestine, and particularly of Jerusalem, has presented in popular form some of the results of his exploration and reading in a book entitled *The Accuracy of the Old Testament* (S.P.C.K.; 6s. net). He believes that archæological study is as necessary as linguistic, and indeed acts as a valuable check upon results reached by linguistic or literary criticism. Obscurities of the text are frequently due not to the writer's ignorance but to our own, and archæology, he maintains, not seldom confirms the accuracy of statements, especially about the early period of Hebrew history, on which scholars had cast doubt. Among other things Mr. Duncan discusses the peoples and the conquest of Palestine, but he is particularly full in dealing with the topography of Jerusalem, especially of Ophel, and with the strategy by which David captured the city. There is a useful chapter on the influence of Canaanite religion upon the Hebrews, which discusses teraphim, standing-stones, altars, serpent-worship, and sun-worship; and he gives a vivid imaginative description of how Samson destroyed the temple of Dagon. It is difficult to see why Mr. Duncan prefers A.V.'s 'grove' to R.V.'s 'asherah.'

The book is greatly enriched by forty excellent illustrations. To his proof of the early use of writing, Mr. Duncan might have added Jg 8^{14}, which is the more valuable as it is quite incidental. Gen. xxvii. should be corrected to xxxvii. (p. 56), 'conqu red' to 'conquered' (p. 66), τελέιος to τέλειος (p. 101), and Jer. cxiv. to xliv. (p. 149). The book contains scores of facts which will be interesting to those to whom archæology is a sealed book.

A good case can be made out for episcopacy on grounds of expediency and experience and common sense. Indeed, there are many Presbyterians to-day who, on these grounds, would welcome episcopal government. In the original form of Scottish Presbyterianism, as designed by Knox, 'superintendents' were a feature, and these were only bishops under another name. But the case for episcopacy is upheld by many on a very different ground, and this ground is taken with firmness in *The Case for Episcopacy*, by Mr. Kenneth D. Mackenzie (S.P.C.K.; 3s. 6d. net). Here is the position in a few words: 'The Episcopal Orders which we desire to share with all other orthodox Christians are not merely a ministry directed by bishops, but a ministry derived, as we believe, through bishops from our Lord Himself.' In maintaining this position the writer commits himself to many questionable statements. To take only one: 'Once suppose that the Apostles founded the institution of the episcopate as distinguished from the presbyterate and all becomes comprehensible.' Is there any scholar of repute (even among Anglo-Catholics) who would approve such an amazing suggestion? But it is only one of many of the same nature which undermine the confidence of an inquiring reader in the competence of his guide. The book is really a very able one, however, and it is both right and useful that the extreme view should be stated, as it is stated here, with force and good temper. The author thinks the only form of Church government incompatible with episcopacy is Congregationalism. He thinks better of Presbyterianism and has hopes of it. But his 'case for episcopacy' is a high and hard wall that will need hard and high climbing.

Patteson of Melanesia, by the Rev. Frank H. L. Paton, B.D. (S.P.C.K.; 3s. 6d. net), is more than a biography of the martyr bishop. Mr. Paton writes with intimate personal knowledge of the myriad islands of the South Seas, their inhabitants, problems, tragedies, and triumphs. He has given us a brief but intensely interesting account of the whole environment in which Patteson did his life's work. And in the centre of the picture he has set that heroic and lovable figure. The narrative is both illuminating and inspiring, and is fitted to raise in every humane and Christian mind 'the challenge of the Pacific.'

When he was a child Dr. S. P. T. Prideaux was taken to a funeral, and was much impressed when the sexton threw the usual three handfuls of earth upon the coffin. Later at school he found the same rite in Horace and elsewhere, and that started his mind on a long journey, part of the fruits of which he has put into his book *Man and his Religion* (Williams & Norgate; 10s. net). He drops us all kinds of information by the way—why heel taps are left in glasses, why we eat Hot Cross Buns, why ships have a bottle broken on them at their launching, and many more on every page or so. But his real inquiry is to consider the rites and the like of our religion, why they are here, and whence they came. He takes us on a rapid pilgrimage over the world, and comes to his conclusions on religion as a whole. And then begins his answer to the question that had haunted him. Is Christianity just one of many possible religions, or is it something more and something final?

There is no hesitation in his answer of some eighty pages; nor are his facts or his findings easily challenged.

In the Study.

Virginibus Puerisque.

Whit-Sunday.

By the Reverend Eric Parsons, B.A., Edinburgh.

'The voice of one crying.'—Lk 3⁴.

Fancy calling a man a Voice! We have all heard of one voice that seemed to wander quite by itself, quite without a body. I mean the 'thin, high, trembling voice' that came floating over the trees on the Treasure Island that Robert Louis Stevenson tells about, that voice which made all the pirates tremble because they thought it was dead Captain Flint singing—a voice without a body. But it was only poor Ben Gunn. There was a body to the voice.

And John the Baptist had a body. Yet he was called a Voice. Why? Because the 'whole man was a sermon.' His words were only a small part of his message. Every bit of him spoke—his shaggy dress, burning eyes, and strong wild figure—all so fierce, and yet with so gentle a touch as he baptized people in the river. Every bit of him spoke, and spoke of God. So he was called a Voice.

You think it strange to call a *man* a Voice? But it is not so very strange. After all, we haven't always spoken to one another with our voices. People used to talk with their whole bodies. Before men could speak or write they made each other understand by pantomime. Babies still do that. And you would have to do it too if you went to France and had not learnt those queer French verbs. Even when we can use our tongues quite well our hands and bodies work with our tongues—every bit of us speaking. When teacher is telling us something we ought not to do he can use words and need not shake his fist at us like the farmer who is too angry to speak because we have trespassed in his fields. But the teacher still wags his finger at us! When a little boy learns to write the spidery, twisty letters, so difficult at first, it is not just his hand that writes and twists and turns. His legs curl round the desk, his shoulders screw themselves up, and his little tongue pops in and out, twisting and curling with the hand that moves on the paper. Every bit of us speaks, telling of what our hearts and minds are set on.

Now we are not like savage men, or babies. We can talk and write. But still our best and truest message is our whole self, rather than our words. In two ways you can see what this means.

John was a voice preaching. Nowadays we listen to a preacher speaking words from a pulpit. But if that is the only way he preaches it is a poor way compared with John's. Nobody takes much notice of words by themselves. The world knows our real sermon whatever we may *say*. For we are all sermons, each one of us, messages shown to the world—maybe about ourselves—maybe about Jesus. What an idea that is, that we are all Voices, crying and shouting to the world, though we may never speak a word—each of us a sermon about Jesus!

Jesus was a Voice preaching. Nowadays we can read and hear of Him. But oh! to have known and seen Him, watched His ways! He knew that we would feel like that, knew that no book or sermon or words could replace Him or speak to us like His own self. So He never really went away. Of course we cannot see Him. But you know what you ask mother when you really must go to bed and must not shout downstairs, however lonely you feel? You ask her to leave the door open just a little bit, and then you'll feel she is near to you in the darkness. You'll be quite sure that she is there. Well, Jesus has done the same with the ones He loves. Easter opened the door to all His children, and Whit-Sunday kept the door open. And that comfortable feel we have when we know mother is near is like the presence of Jesus. He left us in the dark; He had to. But He left us with a Comforter. He knew that there was no message or word like the presence of Himself.

A Nasty Wicket.

By the Reverend Robert Strong, M.A., B.Litt., Leeds.

'Whatsoever thy hand findeth to do, do it with thy might.'—Ec 9¹⁰.

All of us would choose a good wicket if we could get one, so that we might be free to show our skill, without any of the unexpected difficulties that the bad wicket presents. We don't blame the captain who would rather not accept the risks when he thinks the wicket is too bad for play. But if the umpire decides that the game must go on, we admire the team that settles down to play the game for all they're worth, making the very best of the situation. We say quite rightly, 'That's cricket.'

One of the joys of youth is that we dream of life, and think of the game as one that is going to be played on a good wicket. When we are going up for our examinations we have a secret confidence that, having done our best, the examiner will ask us just those questions we do know something about, so that we can show our real powers, and make a stand, pleasing to ourselves and everybody else. Or we dream of those later days, when we have passed from the stage of school, and expect that when we go out into the bigger world of affairs we may meet wise kindly people, find a good opening, and in business or profession play the game with some show of glory. We shall be all the wiser if we know that life doesn't always provide a good wicket for our displays, that there are all sorts of tricks of fortune which insist that we go on to play the game when many facts are dead against our chances. Examiners don't always seem specially interested in the things we have got up with so much care, and seem to be fond of those matters to which we have given only the slightest attention. In business, we may find that people are not always keen on giving us a chance, so many of them being too busy seeking chances for themselves, so that they don't mind pushing others out of the way instead of helping them. There is no sense in being afraid of these facts, but it is good sense to make up our minds what we mean to do when the wicket is a pretty bad one, as, of course, it sometimes is.

Here are three rules for playing the game on a nasty wicket.

Don't sulk. It would be easy, so easy indeed, that it really isn't worth doing, to sulk about the whole thing. Why should we have to play on a pitch like this? Why should we have such bad luck, when people not half as good as we are, seem to have no end of splendid opportunities? Well, we had better tell ourselves that this kind of talk is not cricket, and in the great game of life a sportsman is not going to spend his time in being sorry for himself. When Elijah began to talk in this rather dreary fashion, there was nothing for it but to get him out of his cave, and set him on the mount before the Lord, so that he might forget himself and see that he belonged to a team. It was rather a shock to him to realize that he was by no means alone, and that sulking was only foolishness. When the hard times come, that bit of good humour which saves a man from thinking too much about his own desires, and sends him merrily into the fray, will help him to win through, and that not without glory.

Be patient. When the wicket is tricky there is no time for taking any foolish risks. Saving the game demands a patience that will not tire. Don't let anybody imagine that the patient way is the easy way. It takes vastly more courage and resistance to play the game after this fashion, than to do rash impulsive things. Only a perfectly disciplined hand, eye, and mind will serve a man when the task is of this order. When the hard times come in life, all the self-control we have been able to develop will find its use. If we have never learned to use the courage of patience, the nasty wicket may easily beat us. This needs to be trained all the time, so that the new situation does not startle us into failure.

Watch for chances. On the bad wicket there will come now and again the chance to do a good thing and send up the score. All the men who have ever done anything worth while in the world have done this, not because facts were always in their favour, but because they have learned to expect chances even in bad times, and have not been slow to take advantage of them. Captain Scott was set a difficult pitch, but what a game he played! This is what A. Cherry-Garrard says about him: 'He was not a very strong man physically, and was in his youth a weakly child not expected to live. He will go down to history as the Englishman who conquered the South Pole, and who died as fine a death as any man has had the honour to die. His triumphs are many—but the Pole was not by any means the greatest of them. Surely the greatest was that by which he conquered his weaker self, and became the strong leader whom we went to follow and came to love.'

The Christian Year.

First Sunday after Trinity.

Immortality and the Comforter.

'If a man die, shall he live again?'—Job 14[14].

'If it were not so, I would have told you.'—Jn 14[2].

Perhaps the oldest and most persistent question of the human heart is that of the immortality of the soul, the persistence of personality beyond the grave. There seems never to have been a time when mankind was not considering it. Job was not the first person to articulate the ancient query; nor was he the last.

To-day, as yesterday, the answers given to this age-old question are of three general types. In the first place, there is the denial of the doubter. In the absence of any actual knowledge as to the reality of immortality such a person insists that he cannot feel that the preponderance of probability is sufficient to justify belief in the theory. Such a man was Thomas Huxley, for example. Even when he stood by the grave of his oldest child, Noel, overwhelmed with grief, and his great-hearted friend, Charles Kingsley, besought him to find comfort in the immortal hope, Mr. Huxley replied, 'I have searched over the ground of my belief, and if wife and child and name and fame were all to be lost to me, one after the other, as the penalty, still I would not lie.'

In the second place, there is the answer of indifference. Always there have been those who are simply not concerned with the question of immortality for the reason that they deem the whole issue quite inconsequential. Here, for example, are men who are face to face with daily duties, challenging tasks and captivating opportunities. 'Why think of what lies beyond?' they ask. 'To dream of the hereafter dampens one's ardour to work while here. There may not, indeed, be any immortality for the individual soul. Think, then, of the immortality of influence one may achieve. Work not for your own soul's sake, but for humanity's sake.'

Before passing, therefore, to the consideration of the third type of answer—that of the triumphant believer—let us ask briefly just what difference it *does* make whether we believe in immortality. To cite a single aspect of the problem as illustrative of others, it might be wise to consider the mighty difference the belief in immortality makes in the way we think of *ourselves*. What are we, really: animal or spirit, mud or mind, body or soul? If the former, then we may have our little day and cease to be—and obviously it doesn't matter much what one believes about life after death; indeed, the idea of immortality resolves itself into an absurdity. If, however, we are in reality the latter—spirit, mind, soul—then it would seem that nothing short of eternity would suffice for the development of our spiritual potentialities.

It is because of this fact that there has always been a third class—those whom I would call the triumphant believers! Their answer to the age-old question, 'If a man die, shall he live again?' is a mighty affirmative. But it is the affirmative of a rational faith, not of a blind belief, nor yet of demonstrable knowledge. As Martineau remarked, 'We do not believe in immortality because we can prove it, but we try to prove it because we cannot help believing it.' In other words, the ultimate argument for life after death is the *instinct* of the human soul. 'When God wants to carry a point with His children,' says Emerson, 'He plants His arguments in the instincts.' This, it seems to us, is what Jesus recognized when He met this great issue of immortality with that singularly simple but suggestive statement we have chosen for our second text: 'If it were not so, I would have told you.'

We *know*, really, only the lower things of life. The best things of life we *feel*. We know that two and two make four; we can prove that. But take such a thing as Love, for example—a matter of life and death, if you please. One never knows that another loves him, in the sense that it can be proven beyond peradventure of a doubt so as to convince a mind disposed to believe otherwise. Or take Honour or Integrity. We never know that it pays to be true and honest and strong and noble and pure. All these things are not of knowledge. They are convictions; they are instincts of the soul.

Let us look, then, at some of these instincts; and we shall see how utterly impossible it would be for a good and wise God to allow this human career to cease at the grave.

In the first place, every man is full of *desires*—and the broader and deeper and better the man, the more and greater his desires. Civilization, considered in its wider sense, is but the development of new desires and new ways of gratifying them. Education is but the transforming of low desires into higher, more intellectual, more spiritual desires. Then let us note this: *The better a man's desires in this life, the less probability is there of their gratification!* Nowhere in the lower order of creation are there any desires unless in the environment of the creature there is provided that which can satisfy the desire—nowhere *except in man*. And man's desires! The whole earth cannot meet them.

And what of the *elusiveness of life*? The poet says that man never is, but always to be blest. We live by hope. The realization has always some tiny tinge of disappointment in it. The boy thinks he will be happy when he gets to college, and at college all his dreams are of what he will do when he gets through. And when he accomplishes his success—nine-tenths of them don't accomplish it—but when the one does, he is looking forward still to something, and old age finds him with his back bowed and his hair silvered, still looking forward.

And then, if this life be all, look how all *discipline* is wasted. We spend forty, fifty, sixty years, learning how to live. A man just learns how to live and then he dies. Would a man carefully train his boy to be a mechanic, or an engineer, or an orator, or a writer, or a business man, and then, just as he graduates from college, take him off and kill him? And would God Almighty train men, the best of men, by the discipline of a long life, until they are more nearly able and competent to do and to think properly, and then drop them into oblivion?

Look, too, at *the highest faculties* we have. The more remote a man's aims, the nobler his life. Is it possible that that man who cares nothing for noble purposes and high thought, grovelling in gross gratification, yet living just decently enough to keep out of the penitentiary and avoid social complications, is reaching the real goal of life, rather than those who are perpetually disciplining themselves to a nobler aim?

Then mark a deeper instinct in man, the deepest instinct of all, *the love of life*, that you can never get out of any human being. We call this the first law of Nature—life! *Eternal* life! Could the language of this instinct mean anything else? Eternal life—there must be! Is it not so, O Christ? And He says, as of old, 'If all the deep instincts of your being were to be blasted, I would have told you.'

And then the Bible! It is a book of promises. 'Yet the patriarchs,' says the Apostle, 'died, not having received the promise.' In our own case this Book promises us that Jesus shall save us from sin. Have any of us been saved from sin absolutely? No; we have been saved in a measure, but only in a measure. The perfect salvation does not come in this life. He has said, 'Come unto me, and I will give you rest.' Have we ever received a perfect rest? Not perfect. Perfect joy? Always some bitterness in the cup. Perfect satisfaction? We shall never be satisfied until we awake in His likeness. And so we come to the gates of death with all these fragmentary promises of our instincts in our hands.

We know the story of the ugly duckling. All the ducks in the barnyard made sport of this little awkward stranger. He couldn't walk as they did; his neck was too long and his wings were too clumsy. So all during his duckhood he had to spend his life the scorn of his companions; until one spring day, when the air was balmy and soft, and they heard above them a strange and distant sound as of birds flying and crying, this ugly duckling looked up and saw a little speck in the sky, and then a waving line, and from that line there came the call to him. He tried his wings, he spread them, and then he sprang from the ground and soared into the air, and his companions knew him no more. He did not belong to them. And, by the way, I think they said he had *died*.[1]

SECOND SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

Life's True View-Point.

'In heavenly places in Christ Jesus.'—Eph 2^6.
'I sat where they sat.'—Ezk 3^{15}.

Paul's conception of the work of Christ is, in part at least, that it gives men a new elevation from which to consider life. Of course, there is infinitely more in this great word of his. But this it certainly declares: that when a man is laid hold of by Christ, and becomes united to Him by faith, he ascends with Him to heavenly heights, and sees life thence, not merely in its often perplexing detail, but in the grand design of an overruling God. Isaiah anticipated this very thing when he encouraged men to wait upon the Lord that they might mount up with wings as eagles. And both unite in making it abundantly plain that all such experience of elevation is but preparation for active fellowship in the affairs of the valley. The sacrament of communion with the ascended Lord equips His disciples for the sacrifice of self-interest in the service of human need. Those who mount up must in turn descend to run with zeal and courage upon errands of mercy, and to walk without fainting amid the common trials and tests of earth. What we need most of all to-day is, to combine the conception of Paul with the experience of Ezekiel—that is, to realize the fullness of our redemption in Christ; and, thus inspired, to give ourselves to the service of our fellows in His name.

The true order of faith is not that we have to live an earthly life with a view to heaven, but that we are called to a heavenly life with a view to earth. The common idea is that, by developing a certain kind of character here, men are prepared for the ultimate life of service and worship beyond. And much of the pathetic weakness of the Christian Church in these days of crying need is to be traced to this misconception. As a matter of fact the New Testament declaration is that all true life is heaven-derived. It is a gift, offered and received on the terms of faith, to be translated by obedient and loyal devotion into terms of self-sacrificing service.

This is declared and manifested in Christ Himself. It was as the Man of Heaven that He lived among men. In Him the energy of Sonship was transformed into the enterprise of Saviourhood. He came with the life and love of God—and then sat where the captives sat, amid the lepers, the poor, the broken-hearted, the strugglers. And He sat there, not as spectator, but as partaker of their griefs and sorrows.

---

[1] H. H. Crane, in *If I had only One Sermon to preach on Immortality*, 51.

We are often content to regard ourselves as Christian because we hold to certain beliefs or observe conventional forms. What we need is a new emphasis to the Evangel, recalling us to the fact that according to Christ's teaching and example a man is a Christian only when he is united to Him in this twofold relationship—toward God and men.

The strongest solvent of the varied human difficulties with which Christ's servants have to deal is sympathy. By this is not meant an affected interest in the affairs of others, after the fashion of the superficial person who has an ear for every man's concerns, and a heart for none but his own. It is the product of a twofold intercourse—with God and men. It is at once derived in the sanctuary, and distilled from life's experiences. Ezekiel had never been the prophet he was, nor uttered the message he spoke, had he not sat where he did with the captives. For identification with the sins and temptations of others most surely enables us to help them in regard to the fundamental and abiding things. We may destroy men by influence exerted distantly; but they cannot be healed save by the human touch of one who sits where they sit.

To this fact the history of all great service bears witness. It was as Peter the Great of Russia sat in the squalid cottages of the moujik—coming thither from his throne—that he was able to carry out the noble changes effected in that empire. Elizabeth Fry, descending from the refinements and pieties of a lovely home to sit in the pestilential prison of Newgate, not only lifted the prisoners into something of her own Christian experience, but ultimately made certain also the reform of prison law in the direction of humanity and justice. And all great missionaries—David Brainerd, James Gilmour, William Carey, Adoniram Judson, David Livingstone, Hudson Taylor, and a host of others—have accomplished their life-work only on this wise.

The only preparation and dynamic for such contact with earth is separation unto God. Heavenly heights are not gained except as weights which hold us down are cast aside and cables which bind us to things material and earthly are cut. And it is there, and there alone, in fellowship with Christ, that the double miracle of elevated vision and elevated motive is wrought. How necessary this is, is the consciousness of all who know by experience anything of the elusiveness of motives merely inspired by the sight of sorrow and human suffering. These may, indeed, call forth transient emotions. But nothing save the Spirit of Christ can purify the heart of its evil, and so secure us against the danger of becoming infected by the very things which destroy the lives of those we would fain help. Only by sitting with Him can we be saved from losing heart, as we catch the vision which reveals God at work through all earth's changes, and from the fitfulness which renders service worthless by the reinforcement of His own steadfastness.

Life is for us all a great mission. But we shall miss its meaning and opportunity if we fail to regard it from this double view-point.[1]

THIRD SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

The Virgin Birth.

'Behold, the virgin shall be with child, and shall bring forth a son.'—Mt 1[23] (R.V.).

The subject of the Virgin Birth is one that has caused a good deal of difficulty to sincere souls, and has given rise to considerable doubt in serious minds. To dismiss the whole subject as irrelevant to Christianity is hardly possible, because it is not only explicitly confessed in the great Creeds, but it is affirmed in the *Te Deum* and in many of our favourite hymns.

1. The literary evidence is by some held to be insufficient. It is confined to two passages in the Gospels.

The story of the Virgin Birth is found only in the Gospels of St. Matthew and St. Luke, and there only in the opening chapters; for in the rest of these Gospels Jesus is spoken of as if He were the son of Joseph and Mary. Might not these earlier chapters have been added later? All we can say is that there is no manuscript evidence to give any support to this suggestion. It is pointed out that the clear assertion of a Virgin Birth is confined in St. Luke to only two verses (1[34] and 3[23]). Of the first of these there is manuscript evidence for omission; but it is found only in one manuscript, a second-rate Latin version which would carry no authority on any other peculiarity.

A more serious weight attaches to the fact that the early and important Syriac version known as the Codex Sinaiticus reads in the genealogy of St. Matthew (1[16]), 'Joseph begat Jesus.' This reading is supported by two or three manuscripts of the Old

---

[1] J. S. Holden, *The Confidence of Faith*, 66.

Latin version, and by two late Greek manuscripts. It is possible that this might represent the original text; for the genealogy as traced in St. Matthew really demands that Jesus should be reckoned as the son of Joseph; but, even if so, it would only be in line with the conventional statements in the rest of the Gospels where Jesus is spoken of as the son of Joseph. It is because of the great doctrinal importance of the passage that this peculiar testimony has deserved any consideration at all; it is only an interesting variant. Thus we are compelled to sum up the literary evidence, so far as it goes, as overwhelmingly consistent and unwavering.

But there is the complete silence of the rest of the New Testament. We need not count one way or the other the general habit of Jesus being spoken of both by the people and by Mary as if He were the son of Joseph; that would be inevitable.

But if there is no evidence elsewhere in the rest of the New Testament, there are a number of allusions which are in keeping with the fact of a Virgin Birth. St. Paul could hardly be expected to refer to it, from the nature of his Epistles and the general absence of detail about the life of Christ; but he does say, 'God sent forth his Son, born of a woman.' This is not the only Hebrew way of referring to human birth; and though it does not affirm the Virgin Birth by any means, it does not deny it, as any other expression for human birth might have done. The silence of St. Mark is natural, as he begins his story with the baptism; but what is curious is that he never mentions Joseph by name at all or refers to the father of Jesus; and in one verse, where St. Matthew and St. Luke have the question, 'Is not this the carpenter's son?' and 'Is not this the son of Joseph?' respectively, he has, 'Is not this the carpenter, the son of Mary?' This is something more than silence, and perhaps something more than coincidence.

2. It is alleged that the story can be explained easier than as fact. It may be due to the influence of prophecy. Our text is a quotation from Is 7^{14}; and it is suggested that the prophecy may have given rise to the whole idea. It will be noticed that there is no quotation of this prophecy in St. Luke; and it is difficult to see how the quotation can have influenced St. Matthew thus far. For the Hebrew word need not mean 'virgin,' and Jewish commentators do not take the original meaning to be a promise of a virgin birth or regard it as a prediction concerning the Messiah. Like the rest of St. Matthew's quotations, it is so completely apart from its original meaning that it is vastly easier to comprehend how the fact could have recalled the prophecy than the prophecy have created the story.

It is frequently alleged that the idea of a virgin birth is to be found in heathen religions; and it is therefore no marvel that it arose in Christianity. But that is just the difficulty; for even if it were a frequent incident of pagan mythology, that would hardly have recommended it to the Jewish mind, with its exclusiveness and its hatred of heathenism. Moreover, if we examine the alleged instances of virgin-birth myths, as Perseus, Romulus and Remus, or Isis, they turn out to be anything but virgin births.

Others think that the poetic impulse is sufficient to account for the story. We need not dispute that the Nativity stories are poetic in form; they are most beautifully told, and full of restraint, as a comparison with the Apocryphal Gospels sufficiently reveals. But the poetry is due not to the telling of the story, for that is very plain and matter of fact, but to the beauty of the subject. And if this story had been told merely as a poetic myth in order to show that all birth is pure and begotten of God, it was unfortunate so deliberately to exclude the male parent; for, owing to wrong interpretations of why this was necessary, it has had anything but this effect. We are driven, therefore, to conclude that no explanation but the one of fact at present holds the field.

3. The real difficulty lies in the want of a rational necessity for the Virgin Birth. This is not satisfied by saying that it was a miracle. We are not so inclined to shy at the word 'miracle' to-day. We are able to believe that while God works normally along the lines of what we call natural law, He is not bound by that when some higher necessity calls. If the Virgin Birth is a miracle, we have only to show that it was an absolutely necessary miracle. This is not shown, to our mind, by the necessity of introducing a new race; for the race of the spiritually reborn continues to be born physically in the ordinary way. Neither can there be any plea that it was necessary in order to prove the Divine origin of Jesus; miracles are not wrought in order to produce faith.

Nor can we accept the common explanation that the Virgin Birth was necessary in order that Christ should be born sinless. For this would involve admitting that the ordinary method of generation is essentially sinful.

A much more natural necessity can be suggested. The Virgin Birth was necessary for the purpose of the Incarnation. Recall what that purpose was. It was twofold: to reveal God to man; and to reconcile man to God. For the former, it is absolutely essential that God reveal Himself *in person*; nothing less can give us an assured revelation. Therefore, if Christ is the incarnation of God, His Person must be Divine. But in order to fulfil the second necessity, that of reconciling man to God, that Divine Person must live a truly human life, within the normal limitations of a human body, mind, and soul; so that while the person is absolutely Divine, the life is a truly human achievement. Now, this involves that the person of Jesus must have been pre-existent. But the ordinary method of generation produces a new person; if, therefore, there had been the ordinary method of generation, we should have had two persons, entailing dual personality, with nothing higher to unite; for person is the highest category of being. Or the one person would have had to be destroyed, or suppressed, or absorbed by the other. This is just what Nestorianism was condemned as involving; and it is actually the doctrine favoured by modern Theosophy.

Now, if this necessity was the determining factor in the Virgin Birth, it carries with it very important conclusions. We can only suggest what these may possibly be. It shows that God regards human personality as a thing so sacred that there must be no tampering with it; even for the purpose of saving the race. When God planned to save humanity, He could not begin by destroying a human personality. The Virgin Birth, therefore, puts upon human personality the highest possible seal. It is not, let it be said clearly and emphatically, to be deduced that ordinary birth is not sacred enough; but that human personality is too sacred to be interfered with.

A good deal of the objection to the Virgin Birth has come from the critical study of the New Testament, because that has seemed to reveal that the relationship between Mary and her Son was so strained that it precludes any idea that there could have been anything remarkable about His birth. But it may be just because she knew of that, but interpreted it as involving a quite different kind of life, that on various occasions she did not always interpret His will or understand His actions. If there was a misunderstanding between mother and Son, it was one that was almost inevitable; but it was not a misunderstanding that prevented her from giving to her Son the purity of her heart and the piety of His early days. The gospel shows all misunderstandings gone by the time Christ came to die.

There is something of the revolution of all earthly standards about the whole business, of course; but that is what it is meant to be. It means the exaltation of lowliness, poverty, and obscurity to the place of power, glory, and fame. It means that male ascendancy is over, for woman here receives the highest place; and it is therefore the guarantee that every sign of subjection is doomed eventually to disappear. It means the exaltation of the mother and the child, the sanctification of sex, and the purification of everything that affects human conception and generation. It sets the absolute seal of Divine care upon human personality.[1]

FOURTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

Observance and Righteousness.

'Take thou away from me the noise of thy songs; for I will not hear the melody of thy viols. But let judgment run down as waters, and righteousness as a mighty stream.'—Am $5^{23.\ 24}$.

The prophet Amos wants to emphasize the futility of mere religious ceremony and observance without any ethical, social result. It is indeed a tragic picture, this, of a God who is positively bored by worship: who hates our feast days, implores us to leave off our choral services. Tragic, because, with many of us still, the outward sign of religious progress is the proper observance of feasts and fasts and the excellence of our ritual or church music. The Church, as a whole, has not learnt to put the outward observance in its proper place as a means to an end. Neither has it created enthusiasm for the end to which it is the means. The end is God and righteousness. The prophets neither here nor anywhere else disparage religious observance; they only plead for its proper place in spiritual economy. They use startling expressions to wake us up from our complacency. Isaiah, the son of Amoz, talks of the 'iniquity of the solemn meeting,' and chaffs the Temple tramplers. Incense has become an abomination: the Lord is weary of the sabbatarians. Jeremiah is implored by God to persuade the people to leave off praying: it is unnecessary because they are quite certain to pray wrongly. Such expressions are calculated to make us very suspicious of the things in which we are most tempted to place our trust. We need to be shaken out of our childish faith in outward things.

Now, however deeply men may become immersed in formalism, whether of one kind or another, there are always the prophets who see the vision of the true God and the inner meaning of religion. Warnings against unreality in religion,

[1] W. E. Orchard, *The Theology of Jesus*, 65.

the recalling of religious men to the practical conduct required of them by their profession, accompany, or shortly follow after, all religious movements. So we find Bishop Latimer calling the attention of his contemporaries to commercial fraud and avarice, lamenting that things are as bad under the Reformation as they had been under the Pope. In the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries there were societies for the Reformation of manners and Guilds of holy life. We find the Society of Friends wearied by sermons, and even Bible texts, quite as much as irate against sacraments, and pleading for a pure life in the world and not of it as a result of the perception of the inner light of the spirit. They, the most spiritually minded of Christians, became, and still are, foremost in every kind of social reform. We find William Law suggesting a devout life not merely in the seclusion of Christian homes, but in the midst of business and society. While the thrones of Europe were tottering and labour unrest was disturbing, to the point of murder and arson, the whole country, it was men like Maurice and Kingsley who boldly declared that it was the work of the Church to establish God's Kingdom, and that socialists must be Christian and Christians socialist. While the Church, encouraged by political economy, which it did not understand, or which it manipulated for its own ungodly purposes, talked of laws of competition as the laws of God, these men dared to say it was a lie. These were prophets sent by God to England as truly as any sent to Israel in old days.

There are, then, two kinds of revival always going on in the Church, more or less, the Institutional and the Ethical. So long as they are separated they degenerate or fail. The Institutional becomes formal and remote from life: the Ethical becomes dry and uninteresting, separated from religion. What we want is a combination of the two as in the Person of Jesus Christ. He preaches a righteousness which is to exceed the righteousness of the institutionalists, yet not one jot of the law which the institutionalists love is to be allowed to fail. This they are to do and not leave the other undone. In the very act of teaching men what worship really means He inaugurates the greatest ethical revival the world has ever known. He offers the purest worship that has ever been offered to God by the living sacrifice of a will wholly given to the Father, in a life obedient unto death. The special mark of the Institution which He founds is the mutual love of one member for another. The world is to be attracted to His Church not by ceremonial, but by a surprising oneness like the oneness in the Godhead; and His Divine mission will be recognized not by the recitation of Creeds, so much as by the spiritual unity which will be manifested. His followers will acknowledge His authority not because He comes to them with the official recommendation of a Scribe or a Pharisee, but they will be compelled to confess that no man ever spake like this Man. For any one who wants the great reality, God and eternal life, there is obviously no one else to whom to go.

The Kingdom of Love is at hand, and men can enter it if they will. The earth need not be this sorry scene of hatred and ill-will. Follow Him, accept His standard of conduct—a life that is ever turned to the Father and bent on carrying out God's will, a life that finds God in feeding the hungry, and tending the prisoners and the sick, a life of mercy and justice and self-control. And all this not merely for the production of a saint here or there, but as a principle of life which is to pervade all human society; it is to overcome the world. It is the Father's good pleasure to give us the Kingdom. The disciples, then, must be joined together in a body that they may bring about the Kingdom. The Spirit is poured out upon them, and the Church begins. They have a Way of life, faithful to their Master, brotherly to one another.

Here we have the perfection, in ideal, of the Christian Institution and the Christian ethic. Can both live again? Must it ever be that when Christians revive the body of the Church they so often kill the spirit, and when they revive what they think is the spirit they so often decry or quarrel over the body? Can we not have the unity of the spirit in the bond of peace and righteousness of life?

During the last seventy or eighty years there has been a great revival of the Institution in the Church of England. We have rebuilt our churches, our altars, and our fonts; we have improved our services almost beyond recognition; we have re-established our claim to be a true part of the ancient Church of Christ. Side by side with this revival, and often overlapping it, there have been, by the mercy of God, prophets like Maurice and Westcott ever reminding us of the call of Christ to righteousness of national life. There is nothing, perhaps, more sad than the fact that ethical revival is always so much less popular than the other.

Many practical departments of human life are ruled out as not intended to be affected one way or the other by membership in the Church. The newly-confirmed rich young ruler is seldom told that he is to revise his life beyond seeing to his personal purity in sexual matters. He may receive his rents from slums, and sweat his employees, and generally conduct his business or profession in the same way as the worldlings do.

There is an evil spirit which mars Christianity. It has always been angry with the striker, and was never at all displeased with the profiteer until his selfishness extended its baseness to embrace the whole nation. It still looks upon the clerical reformer as a man who impudently interferes with business.

It seems harder to learn toleration in the Church than anywhere else. It is the balance of the really important things in religion which needs adjusting. Much of the time and energy, which we have hitherto bestowed on the outward, needs now to be devoted to the inward. To rescue the inwardness of religion from being stifled does not necessitate the rejection of the outward. It only requires a greater concentration on what is vital. So far from giving up our sacraments let us believe in their reality and set them working. If all the baptized really believed that they were the present possessors of the Kingdom of Heaven: if all the confirmed really believed that they were endued with the Holy Spirit: if all the communicants really believed that they had fed upon the meat that never perishes: if every one who attended the altar went home from the Sacred Presence to give his own body and his own blood for the service of God and man: if every one who read his Bible were really desirous of being imbued with its spirit of faith in God and the mind of Christ, there would be little need for prophets to call us away from a dangerous externalism, for we should be in heaven while on earth, and we should discover that God had poured out His spirit upon all flesh.[1]

Fifth Sunday after Trinity.

The School of Experience.

'I have learned by experience.'—Gn 30[27].

The reason that preaching counts for so little in certain quarters surely arises from the fact that it seems to great multitudes to be a mere mechanical repetition of something which it is supposed to be necessary to believe, with no vivid consciousness, no real appreciation of the modern, urgent cry of human life.

Grey, grey are all the theories,
But green the golden tree of life.

And so men and women are more and more coming back to the old position that experience is the only real teacher. One of the greatest figures of last century, Ibsen, has said of what is perhaps his supreme creation, *Brand*, 'It came into being as the result of something which I had not observed but experienced.' A modern writer—one of the most modern of the moderns—in a very powerful book has said: 'Life is to me just one great experiment: every time one gets more and more hurt, but one at least learns from experience.' He goes on to speak of the help we get from a man who has really lived, and he cites one who has sung as all real men of genius sing—and all real preachers preach, one might say—with a thorn at his throat. 'I have learned from experience.'

To learn by experience does more for us than all the preaching in the world and all the books we have read. Francis Thompson reminds us of the fiery inner experience, the dire spiritual struggle which set the trenches on Dante's brow.

1. Now let us look at two or three of the things that experience has taught us. First of all, experience has taught us *the inadequacy of the things of sense*; 'the irremediable inadequacy,' as Baron Friedrich von Hügel has phrased it, 'of even the totality of all our present earthly conditions, though improved to the utmost—in so far as these conditions do not include, or lead up to, God and His presence—to satisfy the soul's wants.' Perhaps some of us gain an insight similar to that of Wagner's *Parsifal*, an insight gained through temptation. We come to see that the gratification of the sensual appetites can never satisfy an immortal spirit; the thirst of the soul continues and can never be satisfied in anything other than the Eternal. We are realizing this quite vividly on a great scale in the life of the nation to-day. Matthew Arnold in the memorable *Obermann Once More*, writes of pagan Rome:

On that hard Pagan world disgust
And secret loathing fell.
Deep weariness and sated lust
Made human life a hell.

And we are seeing to-day a recrudescence of precisely the same things which preceded the downfall of Rome. There can be no true life in so far as these things dominate the life of the nation, and every individual who succumbs to their spell is weakening the national life. Every time we believe that in the things of sense—'the lust of the flesh and the lust of the eyes, and the pride of life'—that in these we can find true life; every time when by our actions we place our faith in these things we are weakening that Kingdom of God which is slowly coming; we are holding back the chariot wheels of Christ's Kingdom. There could be no more fitting prayer for us, even if it be a prayer between sobs, than this:

---

[1] J. Adderley, *Comprehensive Religion*, 25.

> Pity me still, though eyes that travel hither
> See only how my hands on garlands close—
> Yea, if it needs make some fair blossom wither,
> Or wound me with the thorns upon my rose.

2. Now, in the next place, the lesson taught us by experience is *a new insight into the meaning and glory of suffering*. In Mr. Masefield's recent play in verse entitled *Good Friday*, the only character that really matters—for the figure of our Lord does not appear—is one accounted a madman. He is blind, and at one point he utters these remarkable words: 'I have touched wisdom since they took my eyes.' Think of Milton—as his sight fails him he but learns to see God better. Think of George Matheson, the blind preacher and poet—his sight goes and then he writes the immortal lines:

> O Love that wilt not let me go.

Think of John Bunyan writing his immortal allegory in prison. Think of Tennyson in sorrow for his beloved friend, Arthur Hallam, writing his imperishable 'In Memoriam.' Think of Savonarola, of Livingstone, of Father Damien—all are types of those who turned their weakness into strength and learned in the school of experience that sorrow is not the final word, but that in it there is a strange, exultant joy.

3. Or, again, we learn from our own early experience *not to be deterred in life by what seems to be a final set-back*. What we like most of all about Dr. Johnson is the fact that his life was of such a character that he has been described for all time as one who was 'an old struggler'; one who had passed through experiences which might well have overwhelmed another soul, but still faced the future bravely and with such courage as he might. We learn from experience that victory frequently comes only through defeat. The great words of our Lord, 'Whosoever saveth his life shall lose it,' are interpreted by our own partial experience even here. We know quite well that life is never the flawlessly beautiful thing it appears to confident youth. 'In the midst of the years make known.' It is largely the peril of middle age, when we cannot summon up fresh energy to go on and wage the old warfare and to believe that after all the beautiful early dream is true. Beauty is not simply the thing it appears to youth. The most beautiful thing is worked out from sorrow, courage, prayer, and disappointment—that is the final beauty of life.

We are not minimizing the fact that joy can enable us to live more truly; not turning aside from what every one of us knows to be true—how a sudden, unexpected joy coming into the life irradiates everything—yet we must know that life is not all that, so that we shall not be overwhelmed, not be too greatly surprised when the darker things come.

4. We learn in the school of experience *our own weakness, our own limitation, and we learn to turn to another*. We know there is no salvation in ourselves. We know that it is only by drawing upon an inner and Divine source, upon Christ within, constantly day by day, that we can make life clean, sweet, beautiful, and helpful to others. We learn to trust not in any supposed infallible Church, but in the unfailing Christ. That surely was the secret of St. Paul, who, in one of his highest moments expressed this desire, 'That I may know him and the fellowship of his sufferings.' In life the only people some of us care to know are the successful people. That I may know Him—'despised and rejected of men; a man of sorrows, and acquainted with grief.' There is no experience so illuminating as that of the fellowship of Christ's sufferings. If life has been so far a great disappointment, it is because we have never yet heard the one thing that will illumine it all and make it, if not quite clear, at least not wholly unintelligible. We need something to enable us at least to surmise a hidden harmony in what seems to be appalling discord. Only one master-hand can introduce the long lost chord Divine; it is the hand of Christ.[1]

---

[1] W. Major Scott, in *C.W.P.*, cxvi. 199.

◆

Faith and Knowledge in Pauline and Johannine Thought.

By the Reverend R. Martin Pope, M.A., University College, Southampton.

When, in his speech before the Council of Areopagus, St. Paul proclaimed that 'God . . . hath made of one blood all nations of men . . . that they should seek the Lord, if haply they might feel after him, and find him,' he expressed what may be regarded as an axiom of comparative religion. For the science of religion has but elucidated the fact that there is a universal curiosity in the human consciousness which has led men in all ages to seek for the ultimate reality. 'Canst thou by searching find out God?' was the question put by Zophar to Job, and though the emphasis may be on the personal pronoun, the search for God is assumed as a perpetual activity of the soul, and the finding of God its supreme desire.

There is a further fact which emerges in this connexion. Experience tended to invest this greatest of all quests with a halo of mystery: a mystery that, as Otto says, was not merely something to be wondered at, but something that captivated and intoxicated. It called for the exercise of the highest faculties of mind and spirit. It was not really a task for the multitude, but for the trained mind. The great secret was only attainable by the few. It was left for average humanity more or less blindly to accept their findings. Hence it would appear that the idea of an interior and exclusive knowledge of the Divine is of very ancient origin, possibly coincident with the oldest faiths of the world. Here is the germ of gnosis, the higher, deeper insight into spiritual reality professed by masters, who, having as they believed, found God, have claimed the gift of instructing others in their quest of the unseen, and have founded schools for the cultivation of the hidden gnosis. The gnosis was a knowledge of God not attainable by ordinary intellectual processes. It was a vision of truth apprehended by means of a spiritual illumination or ecstasy. The more august the conception of the numinous, the more certain was the development of the esoteric element, and the greater the vogue of magic and occultism in the rites of initiation practised by the priesthoods of gnosis. For apparently it was the rule that supernatural knowledge involved a preliminary ritual, secret and mysterious.

It is difficult to locate the original source of Gnosticism. Babylonia, Persia, and Egypt have each been claimed by the students of gnostic origins as the home of its first exponents. But the fundamental passion for God and the corresponding attraction of esoteric knowledge are features which tend to recur in all Oriental faiths: and as the latter were modified by, and in turn reacted on, Hellenic culture and philosophy, the resulting syncretism or fusion of belief and practice gave birth to a rich, bewildering progeny of strange speculations, purificatory and expiatory rites, and mysteries in which magic and cabbalistic formulæ and cryptic signs played a part. Systems of initiation like Orphism, a general term for all forms of Dionysus-worship, and specific mysteries like the Eleusinian established themselves in classical Greece; and later came those of the Egyptian Isis and Serapis, the Phrygian Cybele and Attis, the Syrian Adonis, and finally the Mithras of Persia. With the conquest of Alexander the mixing of Oriental beliefs with Greek religion had a marked effect in the tendency to identify deities such as Aphrodite and Isis and to deify great men and kings: it acknowledged the rights of the individual soul, brought into play a missionary spirit, created an impulse towards monotheism, and, above all, quickened the tendency to mysticism. For our immediate purpose it is sufficient to note that Judaism, in spite of its rigid exclusiveness, could not escape these influences: its literature, its religious thought, its outlook on humanity were all modified. The vogue of a new phase of faith—the apocalyptic—was only one of many effects of the new order. It was in the second century B.C. that the Hermetic literature of Egypt took its rise. Purporting to be the teaching of the thrice-greatest Hermes, the Greek name for the God Theuth or Thoth, it was a blend of Babylonian astrology and Greek philosophy with the old traditions of Egyptian religion, and became a rival of Judaism. It was a theosophy, but a theosophy that carried with it sacraments of baptism and rebirth. At the time of the birth of Christ, further results of this widespread fusion of belief and ritual are to be noted. On the one hand, we have a Jewish thinker like Philo making an attempt to reconcile with the O.T., and in particular with the Pentateuch, the speculations of Plato and the Stoics. On the other, we learn on the authority of Philo and Josephus that there existed among the Jews sects which gave a place to Gentile rites and doctrines. The Essenes whom they describe in detail, with their extreme asceticism, their celibacy, their sacramental meals, their system of initiation and secret beliefs which the initiate must swear never to divulge, present all the features of a community of heterodox Jews with tendencies shaped by those Buddhistic influences which affected second-century Gnosticism, so that we may think of them as in effect a Judæo-Gnostic sect. Compare also with them the Therapeutæ of Egypt—a monastic sect of Jews whose tenets and practice also show Buddhistic influence. There is also Mandæan Gnosticism, upon which a large amount of research and critical study has recently been expended, more especially in relation to a possible influence upon the Fourth Gospel. It has been held that Mandaism took its rise in Palestine in a gnostic community based on the cult of John the Baptist. They were opposed probably both to Christians and Jews—so runs the theory—and finally driven into exile. They spread to the lands about the lower Tigris and lower Euphrates, where their descendants are found to-day. Their sacred writings, though they may contain matter of an earlier date, were compiled about the middle of the seventh century. Their only sacrament was baptism. A study of their sacred books reveals a transformation into a medley of beliefs of a Babylonian-Persian nature, in which the tenets of Parsism are conspicuous, and from which it is not easy to draw safe inferences as to the early form of the Mandæan faith. Scholars, however, have emphasized the anti-gnostic and anti-Baptist teaching of the Fourth Gospel in order to uphold the theory that there was a strong Mandæan influence in Ephesus at the end of the first century when the Gospel took its final form.

Such in brief summary are some of the phases of religious beliefs which we ought to keep in mind as we open the New Testament and begin to study in particular the writings of St. Paul. His world was that of the Eastern Mediterranean and, like the Athens of his day, obviously 'religious,' using that epithet to include the God-fearing who were honestly attracted by the theism of the Jew, a select class who regarded the knowledge of the unseen power as a secret worth having, but cultivated the mysteries of Isis and Cybele rather as stimulants of their emotions than as guides to a new morality, and the crowd who, without any sense of moral defect, had a vague interest in ritual which could influence the Divine powers for their worldly benefit, or were moved by custom to honour a local deity or by curiosity to listen to a new teacher. Clearly St. Paul was familiar with every aspect of current religious thought and practice: in particular he was acquainted with the technical sense of gnosis; but it is significant of the new light which came to him through Christ that the basic conception of his teaching is 'faith' rather than 'knowledge.' In one sense, his use of the term is remarkable, because in the Old Testament the words indicating trust or belief suggest the quality of faithfulness or trustworthiness, as in the famous statement of Habakkuk 'the just shall live by faith,' that is, by faithfulness or constancy. On the other hand, the idea of reliance on Yahweh as Lord and God of His people underlies all Hebrew theology: it was, of course, linked with fidelity to the Law, but none the less expresses a conviction of experience, and the Jew never lost his confidence in a personal God.

In this respect Jesus was a Son of Israel: dependence upon God was the foundation of His earthly life; only by virtue of such trust can either His own disciples or the Pharisees fulfil the weightier matters of the Law; only by such faith can man live fearlessly and accomplish impossible things. It is the secret of effective prayer, of healing the body, and of moral salvation. When He required faith in Himself as a condition of discipleship or of moral cure, this did not mean that He superseded God: it was not so much faith in His person as in the power of which He was the channel. It also implied loyalty to the principles He taught and for which He was ready to die. It is true that He claimed to be Messiah; but it was not till He passed into the unseen that an intellectual conviction attached to the confession 'Jesus is Lord.' Nor can faith during His visible earthly career have acquired any element of mysticism. The latter was to find expression in that fellowship with the spiritual Christ which in the teaching of St. Paul was the very essence of the Christian life.

If the confession of Jesus as Messiah or Lord implies intellectual conviction—this is involved in the expression 'the word of faith' which is the substance of his preaching—nevertheless this aspect is subordinated to the conception of faith as a gift of God, a Divine endowment varying in degree with individuals; but whatever be its measure, the vital condition of salvation, the holy life, moral resurrection (or rebirth), and finally of mystic fellowship with Christ. Christians are 'the believers' or 'they who believe,' and to be a

Christian is to be 'in Christ.' The spiritual Christ is, so to speak, the atmosphere in which the Christian lives and moves and has his being. The believer is not identified with Christ in the sense that his personality is absorbed into Christ: it is rather 'Christ that liveth in him.'

Now it is this conception of 'faith' which may be regarded as indicating the powerful influence of Hellenistic theology upon his thought. We may say in effect that his interpretation of faith amounts to a kind of Christian gnosis, and that his use of both terms 'faith' and 'knowledge' indicates closely related aspects of the same ecstatic experience. The *mystica unio* is the result of 'vision' or 'revelation.' Thus it was attained by himself, and presumably it might be the normal experience of any believer. Was, then, the Christian experience a new 'mystery'? Are we to conclude that St. Paul's interpretation of Christianity as union with Christ is closely modelled on the type of current mystery cults?

No one can deny his acquaintance with and adoption of the mystery terms, *e.g.* 'initiated,' 'pneumatic,' 'psychic,' 'perfect,' 'illumination,' 'gnosis,' and others. When he speaks—it is sufficient to quote one example—of the new light, he describes its function as an illumination (*photismos*), or 'a lighting-up of the knowledge (*gnosis*) of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ.' On the other hand, his use of the term 'mystery' never implies a ritual act or sacrament: it is a comprehensive term for the Divine purpose once hidden, now revealed, to include the Gentile world within the covenant of grace. It looks as if he used current terms which had been popularized by common usage, although in course of time their original technical significance had been smoothed away. Other terms and conceptions, such as Soter (Saviour) with the corresponding *soteria* (salvation), Kyrios (Lord), Spirit, Son of God, Logos, are current coin and cannot with certainty be ascribed to a particular source. But one thing is clear, that St. Paul's phrases, *e.g.* 'to live is Christ,' 'in Christ,' 'crucified with Christ,' stand apart from the attainment of divinity which in the mystery cults was achieved by magic or initiatory rite. Reitzenstein quotes from *Poimandres*: 'this is the blessed issue for those who have attained gnosis, to be deified.' This attainment of deity is a concept no one can read into the language of the Apostle: he never suggests absorption into the Divine Being: only fellowship with a particular Saviour, and that—we may add—not limited to a given ecstatic experience, but continuous with life itself.

But, it will be argued—is it not closely allied with sacramental acts such as baptism and the Eucharist? We can only briefly indicate what appears to be the relation between 'faith' and 'sacrament' in his teaching. Both baptisms—lustral washings—and sacramental meals, the eating of a god or what represented a god are rites easily paralleled by pagan ritual; but to St. Paul baptism, though it symbolized entrance into the Christian community and the forgiveness of sins, really implied a dying and a rising with and in Christ. It is not definitely connected with a new birth—that is a later development—but as a symbolic representation of the death and rising of Christ it implies that a new life in Him has begun but is not yet full grown. It is not a 'closed' experience, but initiates a continuous spiritual growth.

The Lord's Supper also sets forth in dramatic form the death of Christ and the benefits thereby assured to the believer, reminding him that by virtue of his own death or self-surrender after the similitude of Christ he has a place in the New Covenant and a share in its promises. There is one very difficult passage, 1 Co 10^{14-22}, which contrasts 'the cup of the Lord' and 'the cup of *dæmonia*,' 'the table of the Lord' and 'the table of *dæmonia*.' This seems to suggest something more than a parallel with the pagan idea that the spirit of the god adheres to the sacrificed flesh and passes into him who eats it. But St. Paul mentions the pagan practice to reprobate it. The Christian cannot share in both meals; and as Mr. A. D. Nock notes,[1] while he uses the phrase 'sharers in demons' (whatever that may mean), he has no corresponding phrase 'sharers in the Lord.'

Again, common meals in memory of a founder, or common meals to which guests are invited by a devotee to meet at the table of a god (as, for example, the god Serapis—an actually authenticated example) who becomes the real host, or the rending of the flesh of bulls or pigs by votaries of Dionysus—a sort of theophagy—to represent the eating of the god, are ritual parallels; but the Eucharist stands apart as not in the first instance involving a communion, but an actual participation in the dying of Christ. The Christian brings to this observance the faith which makes real to him his own self-surrender or inner dying to an old life. We conclude, therefore, that while Christianity has its place within the circle of religious concepts and practice that prevailed in the Hellenistic world, it stands apart and is distinctive: it is never esoteric, but universal in its appeal to the human consciousness, it proclaims an historical Person, not a mythical god, a living Saviour, not a dead founder of a cult, one who is not the deity of a coterie, but the Saviour of all who believe; and finally its sacraments do not *ex opere operato* or automatically make men *pneumatikoi*, nor give by a mere act of reminiscence a salvation for ever guaranteed. For St. Paul the supper of the Lord is far removed from pagan initiation, which often had little relation to morality. The sacramental grace of which the Christian is recipient has to be renewed perpetually in order to the deepening and enriching of the spiritual life. Hence the receiving of the Sacrament is secondary in importance as compared with the actual conduct of a Christian, who, according to St. Paul, can throw away the sacramental blessing by failing to live according to the Spirit or to bring forth the fruits of the Spirit.

---

[1] *Essays on the Trinity and Incarnation*, p. 134.

Are we, then, to exclude what we may call the rational and intellectual apprehension of Christianity from his interpretation of its truths? Does he reduce it to a mystic experience symbolized by the sacramental acts and expressed in a new ethic? When he regards gnosis as a spiritual endowment and links it with 'revelation' and speaks of 'the surpassing worth of knowing Christ and the power of his resurrection,' he indicates a religious condition which is a mystic experience rather than an intellectual process. But he is nevertheless a thinker and has a mind trained in Rabbinic method and lore. He is by no means ignorant of Stoic and other speculative ideas; and he is capable of expounding, as in the Epistle to the Colossians, a conception of the Person of Christ 'than which no better example of Christian gnosis can be given,' and this in reply to a set of doctrines of a gnostic colour, though their groundwork is Judaic. Nevertheless his dialectic touches us less profoundly than his mystic intensity and his whole-hearted passion for the new ethic of Christ. This leads him to place Love above such gifts as prophecy and gnosis (or, in a less abstract sense, *epignosis*). The latter is transitory and partial: all intellectual processes being imperfect when compared with the absolute value of love and the love of Christ 'which surpasses knowledge,' or with that inward peace 'which is above all comprehension.' It has been often noted that even the statement of a great truth, as in the *locus classicus* of Ph 2^{5-11}, is used to point an ethical duty, and this is a common feature in his letters.

On the other hand, when we turn to the Pastoral Epistles, which incorporate genuine Pauline matter while presenting a post-Pauline church development (*e.g.* baptism is now 'a bath of regeneration'), we are met with an intellectualized Christianity in such expressions as 'sound doctrine,' 'rightly dividing the word of truth,' and the phrase 'the contradictions of gnosis falsely so called.' Already a party of simple faith, clinging to tradition, found itself opposed by a party of knowledge. At least, this is on the face of it a probable inference. For Christianity was essentially a missionary religion. It was no longer a Jewish sect: it had awakened to self-consciousness as the exponent of a new view of God and a new way of life, in its contact with the eager, restless, inquiring Græco-Roman world. We need not go beyond the New Testament itself to find evidence of this broadening vision. The Epistle to the Hebrews, *e.g.*, sets forth a kind of Christian Platonism by proclaiming a faith that was the assurance of an unseen order beyond and yet adumbrated by a transitory phenomenal world—a 'better country' for which the loyal witness of Christian heroes and heroines was a preparation and a passport.

But the chief evidence of intellectual advance is seen in the body of writings called Johannine. Whatever may be our critical standpoint in the much-debated questions of authorship, date, and content, all are agreed that they represent an advance on Paulinism, and commend Christianity to the intellect as well as to the faith of a later generation, now keenly alive to, and threatened by, the speculations of heretical teachers, particularly in Asia Minor. Gnosticism had now fastened itself on Christianity, and we are at the beginnings of the fierce struggle which in the second and third century was waged between the Church and the Christian gnostics. That gnosticism was regarded as the chief foe of the truths of the Incarnation and the orthodox doctrine of the Person of Christ is shown by the fact that the earlier Fathers—Irenæus, Justin, Hippolytus, Clement, Tertullian, and others constitute our chief authorities for that system of theosophy which was aroused to amazing activity by the advent and rapid advance of Christianity. It became a rival system of redemption, not ethical as Christianity was, but promising deliverance from a material world regarded as the seat of evil. By means of sacraments and initiations the soul was equipped to pass through planetary systems from the grip of world-powers into the *Pleroma* or sphere of the Divine Being, where it was reunited with God. The work is accomplished by a Soter (or Christus) of supreme rank who is not to be regarded as an historical person, though Jesus as a person of supreme spiritual distinction may be united for a given period with this Divine Redeemer. The system therefore is essentially dualistic: the gnostic Soter who is essentially an abstraction, could not be identified with the Jesus of History. Jesus, indeed, might be regarded as one of the masters of gnosis; but the redemption was effected by a mythological Redeemer, who had to undo the work of an inferior emanation or god called *Sophia*, whose son Demiourgos made the world. The fallen *Sophia* had to be released by the Soter from the prison-house of matter along with the elect 'spirituals' who had fitted themselves for the ascent to God. As the world was essentially immoral, the great aim was to be delivered from it, yet morality did not count: you could rise above matter by being a self-mortifying ascetic, or you could show your independence of matter by being an unbridled libertine. We know that there were sects like the Nicolaitans and Cainites who inverted moral values.

Now the First Epistle of St. John combats the teaching of Cerinthus, who may be regarded as the first Christian gnostic. He taught that Christ (or the Holy Spirit) descended on Jesus at baptism, revealed to him the Fatherhood of God, worked miracles through Him and finally left Him, so that the man Jesus alone suffered and died—an issue which the gnostic would ascribe to the hostility of the world-powers. Christ could not suffer and had returned (to use the expression of Irenæus) to His own *pleroma*. Advanced critics like Loisy have similarly held that the Gospel in a greater degree than St. Paul's Epistles is related to pagan gnosis and is really a Christian-gnostic document, upholding Christ as a sacramental and gnostic Saviour. Probably the view of Dr. E. F. Scott holds the field: he regards it not so much a deliberate polemic, but rather as a defence of the Christian faith, while drawing on gnostic thought as in such antitheses as 'light' and 'darkness' and revealing a certain sympathy with it. The basis is the conception of Christ as the Logos—not the Messiah of a given nation, but 'the Light that lighteth every man,' revealing God with an absoluteness and finality to which no other faith or theosophy could attain in the sense that the mind of Christ is capable of ever-new interpretation as His immanent Spirit reveals Him to succeeding generations. And yet, though clothed with a sort of metaphysical halo, His Person is invested with a real humanity far removed from the phantasmal or docetic humanity of the gnostics. The author is clearly responsive to the influences of gnostic speculation in that he appeals to the reason and intellect more markedly than St. Paul. What place, then, does faith hold in his thought, and how is it related to knowledge?

It is remarkable that he avoids technical terms like 'faith' and 'knowledge' and only uses the corresponding verbs which, as Dean Inge has noted, really agree with the essentially dynamic character of faith and knowledge in his teaching. A man may believe 'in the name of Christ': this is the attitude of confession as a catechumen: he may believe 'on Christ' Himself, and thereby has reached the stage of personal devotion to Christ. This faith is the condition of 'eternal life.' It is a stage on the journey—not a goal. The goal is eternal life defined in the words 'to know thee the only true God and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent.' Hence faith and knowledge are interrelated with knowledge as the crowning achievement of the soul. Knowledge, nevertheless, is not to be regarded as the gnostic stage where moral endeavour ceases. It is still a process: it is a coming to know by a way of illumination: it is not absolute knowledge; it is 'a quality of living which is evolutionary.'[1] Now we have seen that the Pauline conception of faith did not involve the complete suppression of the reasoning faculty, though its essential justification was the ethical life after the pattern of Christ. With St. John knowledge is a greater thing than faith. For him it is not either a mystic state or an esoteric possession open to a few privileged people, the *pneumatikoi*: it is a process of illumination open to all believers whereby the soul has freedom under that spirit who guides into all truth. It implies, of course (*e.g.* 'if the Son shall make you free, ye shall be free indeed'), a moral liberation from the powers of evil and darkness, but it is positively a walking 'in the light,' so that the light grows from more to more for the Spirit-controlled life. The universalism of Christian thought by itself lifts the new faith far beyond the exclusiveness of gnostic and other contemporary cults.

Now, as in the case of St. Paul, we must inquire into the Johannine view of the sacraments. That the gospel is full of symbolism even when the narratives may be held to have a real historical basis is undoubted, but St. John's treatment of the sacraments is remarkable. He omits all reference to the Lord's Supper in the narrative of the Passion, though he introduces a new feature in the sacramental act of the feet-washing. The baptism of Jesus by John the Baptist is omitted, and we are told that Jesus did not baptize, only His disciples.

[1] Ely, *Knowledge of God in Johannine Thought*, p. 144.

John himself is not the great reformer of the Synoptics: he is a herald of One mightier than himself: 'He must increase, I must decrease.' Was this interpretation of John the Baptist, as in effect a preparatory teacher, a reply to the claims of the Mandæan gnostics that John the Baptist was an incarnation of the Supreme Being? We cannot enter into this subject; but it may well be that he had in view the subversive tenets of a contemporary Gnostic-Baptist sect. It has been argued that his silence in relation to the historical foundation of the Lord's Supper may be due to a quasi-materialistic view of the sacraments, to which the members of Asiatic churches had become prone under the influences of their surroundings. But as against this view, there is the fact that the discourses in the third and sixth chapter express a profoundly spiritual conception of the sacraments which show an advance on the Pauline view, and incidentally suggests that the author regarded the origin of the Lord's Supper as a familiar fact. In the conversation with Nicodemus he announces the conception of a new birth (already prepared for by the new birth of the Pastorals) as a vital condition of 'seeing' or spiritually appropriating the Kingdom: and as if it might be thought that there were any magical virtue in the rite of baptism *per se*, he adds the words, 'Except a man be born of water *and the Spirit*, he cannot enter the kingdom of heaven.' But even more striking are the Eucharistic illusions on the sixth chapter: 'The bread that I will give is my flesh, which I give for the life of the world'; 'Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man, and drink his blood, ye have no life in you'; 'He that eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, dwelleth in me, and I in him.' And the conclusion is: 'It is the spirit that quickeneth: the flesh profiteth nothing.' The Last Supper was as yet a future event when these words were uttered: but the discourse is clearly the production of a mind to whom the Eucharist was now a familiar rite, charged with a spiritual significance of great intensity. As they stand, the words are far removed from the material and sensuous theophagy of a pagan or mystery sacramental meal. They suggest that every Christian incorporates or assimilates in some measure the life not of a mythical god or hero, but of a Spiritual Being, conceived to be for ever living, and for ever self-imparting. They suggest this truth as involved in the actual participation in a common meal which has a sacramental significance. In other words, he gives to the Eucharist the idea of communion which St. Paul's dramatic re-enactment of the death of Jesus does not explicitly convey. His keynote is not the death but the life of Jesus. Parallelism with current conceptions and ritual may be granted, but the approach to the sacraments is from an entirely new standpoint.

To sum up, the Johannine writings by their conception of the knowledge of God as equated with 'eternal life' and their profoundly spiritualized setting of the sacraments are an advance upon, or rather a rich complement of, St. Paul's views. St. Paul's 'faith' is a mystic experience which is in a sense almost one with his concept of gnosis: both faith and knowledge tend to merge into one another as gifts of God and as the product of inspiration: and his interpretation stands apart from all Hellenistic parallels by its emphasis on the ethical issues which alone establish the reality of the mystic fellowship with Christ. St. John, on the other hand, leaves room for the exercise of intellect and reason. The whole setting of his Christology is philosophical and has a metaphysical basis lacking in St. Paul. Faith is devotion to a Divine Christ, who is also the 'Logos of life,' as a life-giving personality: its issue is a mystic experience called 'eternal life,' a possession which is not static, but dynamic, and involves an ever-advancing development of all the faculties of the soul. While both have felt the influences of current Hellenistic religious belief and praxis, its mysteries, its gnosis, its dualism, its sacramental systems, both have transcended these influences by making a mystical union with Christ, not a mechanically secured privilege, but an inward reality open to all: and, further, by their absolute conviction that He is an historical personality 'of one substance with the Father.' The Fourth Gospel goes further by reconciling faith and reason in a full-orbed Christian experience.

The true successor of St. John is Clement of Alexandria, who saved the Church from the robust but too rigid obscurantism of Tertullian by proclaiming that faith and knowledge are not mutually opposed, agreeing with Plato in believing that faith takes its rise in wonder or admiration and leads up to knowledge, which is

> 'a sure and firm demonstration of the things received through faith being itself built up by the Lord's teaching on the foundation of the faith and carrying us on to unshaken conviction and scientific certainty' (Strom. vii. 10–57).

When gnosticism with its subtle speculations and specious theosophy had aroused the critical spirit of the leaders of the Church to an examination of the first principles of their faith, then, as to-day, Fundamentalism was leagued against the point of view popularly known as Modernism. According to Tertullian ('I believe in the impossible just because it is impossible'), simple faith was sufficient to counteract the deadly intellectualism of the gnostics. Clement succeeded in keeping the door open to intellectual inquiry and the rights of reason, thereby more truly upholding—as he clearly does in his portrait of the *gnostikos*, or enlightened Christian—the spirit and teaching of both St. Paul and St. John. But chiefly of St. John, whose doctrine of the immanent Spirit—for ever guiding and illuminating the believer—is the foundation of his thought. He teaches us to look for the seat of authority not in tradition, however venerable and august, but in the perpetual testimony of the Spirit of Truth which keeps both soul and intellect alive to the inspiration of all new light, and in the inevitable flux of dogmas, forms, and institutions is for ever drawing on what is Christ's and disclosing it to us.

The Words from the Cross.

VII. 'And when Jesus had cried with a loud voice, he said, Father into thy hands I commend my spirit' (Luke xxiii. 46).

By the Reverend Thomas Yates, D.D., Bournemouth.

There is no embroidery in the narratives of the Passion and the Cross in the Gospels. They are direct and even laconic, without trace of dramatization, and with no comment. When St. Luke has to tell of the worst thing ever told about human nature, and of the classic example of corporate guilt, there is only the curt, bald statement, 'There they crucified him.' Yet this same Evangelist is not able to set down with the same simple bluntness, 'He died.' Nor can any of the others, when they wrote their own accounts. There was more in it than could be told by the simplicity of 'He died.' The impression left by that tragic moment was not simply of one who could bear no more, and gave up the struggle. It was the impression of One who, with powers of will and choice still in His possession, rallied them all, and *gave Himself*. There was a conscious self-giving in the very article of death. It was not the sob of a thinned and ebbing tide the onlookers heard, but the full note of a life-choice, flooding forth in the face of death. 'He yielded up His spirit,' is St. Matthew's revealing account, and the illuminating comment upon this is the heart of the allegory of the Good Shepherd in the Fourth Gospel, 'This is why my Father loves me, because I lay down my life to take it again. No one taketh it from me, I lay it down of my own accord. I have my Father's command for this.' When the sense of His Father's presence had been the surest thing in His daily experience, His Father's command had been His one guide. When in the darkest hour the sense of that presence was for a moment lost and gone, the command remains. In the absence of His consciousness of the Father's nearness, it is still His meat and drink to do the Father's will. The faith that stands in experience is a victory that overcometh the world, but the faith that can stand in the absence of experience overcometh more than the world. It is the victory of the spirit over the powers beyond the world. It is the overcoming of the last enemy.

The three Synoptics all tell that it was with a loud cry that Jesus made His final self-committal to God. Everything must have been in the tone and accent of that cry. The thing that He said as He thus loudly cried are words which can be uttered so diversely. They may sound like the expression of a dim hope which is half a despair. They can be imagined as the half-strangled gasp of some one confronting with dismay the last necessity, and hardly knowing what is said. They can be read as if they came from a soul nearly drowned in the cold flood, and grasping with desperate grip some broken piece, in hope that somehow and somewhere he will be floated ashore.

But there is something here of a wholly different order, and if we can catch the right accent we may be able to understand the victory. Twice did Jesus loudly cry upon the Cross. Once it was a cry of horror, and once it was a cry of joy. When He knew the abyss of desolation, 'My God! my God! why hast thou forsaken me?' He cried with a loud voice. That life can reach a sense of God-forsakenness smote His soul with a great horror as He made that experience His own. It was the first loud cry of Jesus. But the second time He cried with a loud voice, it was again a cry of surprise. It was strange that a soul should know desertion, passing strange for such a soul as His; but more wonderful by far was it to pass from this in sudden transition into the profoundest realization of the Father and of His love.

This is reality for Him, for there was no play-acting when Jesus died. It is reality for us, for this is our Brother. This our Brother is the great third brother of a story He Himself once told. The other Brother is not in the story of the Prodigal Son, because it was Himself, the other Brother, who was telling the story. That other Brother took the track of the wandering prodigal to find him and bring him back. His loud cry of forsakenness is the very cry of the far country. 'My God! why hast thou forsaken me?' is the authentic voice of the far country. But the second loud cry was the cry of the Homecomer who sees the face of the Father, and knows that He may come home and rest secure in the Father's love. And not He alone; He is the way for every soul among us to move out to the same receiving Father. We are brought nigh by the blood of Jesus.

It is the magnificence of Divine grace that there waits for our receiving, and as an everlasting surprise, the nearness and availableness of the infinite mercy and goodness of God. Between the awful cry of forsakenness and the cry of discovery and rest there need be but a moment and a movement. Believest thou this? It is the everlasting reality which flooded the pure soul of Jesus in His passing. 'Into thy hands I commend my spirit.' 'O death, where is thy sting?'

There is more. If my soul can take hold of this 'Into thy hands,' not in a momentary fervour, but reaching down into it, and living within it, as an abiding creed, then will I say not only, 'O death, where is thy sting?' but I will cry also, 'O world! O life! where is thy menace and thy power to harm?' With all their sinister things, all their chances and mischances, all their blows of circumstance, all their buffetings of fate, all their seductions of evil, they have lost their sting. If only my soul can get down on to this as its final faith, 'Father, into thy hands!'

We want to know what is behind this strange world which crucifies its best. We want to know what is underneath and behind the last strange mystery of death. If we can get behind both these, can we hope to find something substantial, or anything good? Is it all just law—mechanical, rigid, remorseless? Is it fate, so that my seeming choices are a mockery, and myself a cog in a machine? Is it all chance, so that we are puppets dancing at the end of a string, and some one pulling the strings and sometimes only for mischief?

These are the big questions of philosophy, and not without their great answers from that quarter. But at the end of these answers, it is faith and religion which have to take up the tale and say the last word. The last word is God. The God revealed in Jesus Christ; the God who was loyal to Jesus in His human career, and who brought Him through death. His arm is not shortened that it cannot save. With Him is power of redemption. Do not speak of our Saviour falling back like a tired child on the arms of God. It is a beautiful picture, but it is not the real sight of Jesus on His Cross. A tired child does not cry with a loud voice. See Him rather as Greatheart, the Strong Son of God, nearly beaten and broken by life's evil and malignancy, but finding God surer and greater than everything else, and knowing in the last great moment that He can be sure of, and is secure, in Him.

What is our life? A poor thing blown about like a vapour, slipping like sand through our fingers, a flickering candle in the winds, soon out and soon over? 'Underneath are the everlasting arms,' said an ancient seer. If we can get down to this underneath, down into it as a refuge so that out of its deeps our souls can cry, 'Into thy hands we commend our spirits, Father,' then we grow quiet and strong. We know then that we are not the frail creatures of a day, but sons of God. Life has lost its fear, and death its sting, and we can laugh at the sun and the shining stars, for when they are old, cold and dead, we shall be found—found in Him.

This word of Jesus on His Cross has, then, as much to do with living as with dying. Jesus did not begin to say, 'Father, into thy hands I commend my spirit,' when dying. He had been saying it all His life. Through youth and manhood He had used these words as the gates of each day opened, and as they closed. Life's ending will likely be as life's habit.

To make this conscious, deliberate surrender of life to God, and to take life's way as those who are committed thus, is to make the ending secure of peace. Said the angel to the pilgrim at the river, 'It is because thou didst hear that now thou dost not fear. Thou hast forestalled the going, and so for thee the bitterness of death is passed.'

We who believe in Jesus must believe with Him in this, and make His last cry on the Cross into our living and operative credo and confession. And if the grapple of the world is tightly on us, so that we feel the moral and spiritual coil in which we are entangled to be so hopeless that if left to ourselves it will be a fate, the more we must wrestle past ourselves, and summon all our faith to this venture, until we believe mightily that God is good enough, His grace and love assured enough, His power to save adequate enough for us in life, in death, and for ever.

There is a much thumbed page in my old copy of Browning, and the book almost opens itself there. It is Browning's '*Instans Tyrannus*,' the tale of a vexed, brow-beaten creature, and of how his persecutor laid his last plan 'to extinguish the man.'

> Over-head, did my thunder combine
> With my underground mine:
> Till I looked from my labour content
> To enjoy the event.

That event was to be the doom of the soul.

> When sudden . . . how think ye, the end?
> Did I say, 'without friend'?
> Say, rather, from marge to blue marge
> The whole sky grew his targe
> With the sun's self for visible boss,
> While an Arm ran across
> Which the earth heaved beneath like a breast
> Where the wretch was safe prest!
> Do you see? Just my vengeance complete,
> The man sprang to his feet,
> Stood erect, caught at God's skirts, and prayed!
> —So, *I* was afraid!

We hear again these sayings of Jesus from His Cross. Let us at the hearing, and in sight of that solemn Cross, like that man in Browning's story, spring to our feet, stand erect, catch at God's skirts, and pray.

Saviour of men, we reach through Thy dying cry, past Thy very Cross, and catch at the skirts of God, for life and for death. 'Into thy hands we commend our spirits.'

◆

Recent Foreign Theology.

Otto on Indian Religion.

In recent years Professor Otto has written much on Indian mysticism and its significance for Western minds, and the mistaken notion may have gone abroad that he believed himself to have discovered a good substitute for Christianity. This booklet[1] ought to dispel the error. It is full of the sympathy which makes Otto perhaps the most discerning of all theological writers on Indian religion, but also of the Christian decision that never loses touch with history and spiritual fact.

Are there messages of salvation, in India or elsewhere, which might rightly claim to displace the gospel? Certainly the great Indian faiths do profess to impart salvation; they are to-day sending missionaries to Europe and America. The only formidable rival of Christianity, Otto holds, is not acosmistic mysticism, but the Bhakti-faith. For it speaks of fellowship with God, of salvation not by knowledge or by works but by faith alone, of the immanence of a personal and transcendent God who emphatically is not identical with the world, of two kinds of life (the worldly and the spiritual), of evangelism, of the word of promise, of eternal election and utter grace, of a present redemption. 'The rescue of the sheerly lost, of those who have neither claim nor value, their rescue not through their own power or merit but solely by free, unconditioned, electing grace—this has been taught as much in India as by ourselves.' The theology of Ramanuja and his followers reveals the most curious and detailed parallels to the Protestant discussions on grace. We can hardly wonder that Xavier, encountering the Bhakti-faith in Japan, wrote home to say that among the Buddhists there he had found the Lutheran heresy.

It is clear that Otto has a keen eye for similarities, and we may ask ourselves (apropos, for instance, of the Fall) whether he is not finding them where they have no existence. But if we wait and see, it transpires that the contrasts are greater still, and are vital.

He points out that the Gita and the New Testament are in different worlds, as the Hebrew prophets and the New Testament are not. There is nothing in Indian thought like the idea of the Kingdom of

---

[1] *Indiens Gnadenreligion und das Christentum*, by Professor Rudolf Otto (Gotha: Leopold Klotz; 1930, pp. 110).

God. Even the Bhakti-religion knows nothing of a goal or *telos* of the world, just as it lacks the essential conception of God the Creator. Similarly, the idea of religious brotherhood, though present, is fortuitous and external, and the Golden Rule is never stated in its *positive* form. India's view of work regards it, not as a thing intrinsically noble, but as a means to an ascetic end. How vast, too, is the difference between Indian and Christian conceptions of what we have to be saved from! Even at its best—and the Bhakti-faith *is* its best—India knows but little of what Scripture calls 'the contrite heart,' as it knows comparatively little of conscience. Not from sin's guilt and power is deliverance offered, but from non-being into being. If we try to move from the religion of Bhakti to Christianity, we find that it cannot be done, as it were, by continuous and homogeneous advance, but only *per saltum*.

Everything, of course, goes back to the distinctiveness of Jesus Christ, for all other terms of comparison are but abstract nouns, like holiness and being; but touch with Him brings us to concrete reality. And what Dr. Otto has to say about Christ as Atoner is so deep-going that we wish it had been twice as long. There is an exceptionally interesting footnote on p. 81, where we are told that the writer's famous book *The Idea of the Holy*, which is almost as well known here as in Germany, arose out of his efforts, as a lecturer, to make an avenue of approach to the doctrine of Atonement. 'This is the problem,' he writes, 'which most sharply distinguishes Christian theology from that of the Bhakti-religion, nay, from Indian religion of every kind. For India has no "Atoner," no Golgotha, no Cross. And in all that it can see nothing but "relics of Judaism"' (p. 85). There is no *a priori* or logical way of settling this dispute; our eyes must be opened to see what we really need.

There is a passage on p. 98 which reveals Otto as a true spiritual successor to Herrmann. He is speaking of Jesus' ability, while He lived among men, to produce conviction of sin. 'Even the influence of Him who is dying on the Cross is not in quality different from what His influence had been when living. Any one who came to Him with faith and understanding experienced before he went away what came to Isaiah when his lips were touched with the live coal. What was "finished" at Calvary was the very meaning of Jesus' *life*. It was not only when Christ died that Peter felt what Isaiah felt; he felt it when he sank down before Him with the prayer, "Depart from me, for I am a sinful man"; and when this prayer was *not* granted.'

Perhaps it is worth while to ask whether the resemblances between Christianity and the Bhakti-faith, on which Dr. Otto insists in the first part of his rewarding book, *can* be so close as he suggests, if finally the two religions are severed by so deep a gulf. Surely in all the genuine features of a religion there is a single characteristic quality, and if it is absent at all, it is absent everywhere. We are therefore driven to inquire more deeply, and to ask in what degree the resemblances are verbal merely.

Do not the first lines on p. 95 bring to a head the reader's growing sense that the book, which it is almost unfair to criticise, needs a glossary of Indian words?

H. R. MACKINTOSH.

Edinburgh.

French Theology.

MUCH has been written on the religious history of Egypt before the time of the Pyramids, but a fresh and suggestive book, *Études sur les Origines de la Religion de l'Égypte* (Luzac, London; 105 pp., 10s.), has come from the pen of Dr. Samuel A. B. Mercer, Professor of Egyptology in Toronto University, with a preface by Professor A. Moret, of the French Institute. The volume, which is issued under the 'Oriental Research' Series, has been written in French owing to the fact that the author, who was a student under Gaston Maspero, received from him a large number of personal notes or jottings, which it was desirable to embody with as little change as possible. Though based to some extent on this French Egyptologist's theories, it shows a careful examination of new sources, as well as considerable personal research. The author seeks to prove that the Egyptians represented four races and four religions, viz. worshippers of Seth, worshippers of Horus from Arabia, worshippers of Osiris from Syria, and worshippers of Re from the isles of the Mediterranean. How far these views are correct need not be discussed here. Not all Egyptologists will agree with the writer when he attributes a preponderating influence on the early prehistoric civilizations to Semitic elements coming from the Wady Hammamat. On this point Professor Moret himself is less affirmative. But all will no doubt agree with the author's treatment of the Egyptian religion from the evolutionary point of view, a theory adopted not only by Maspero, but by Pietchman, Ed. Meyer, Tiele, and British scholars. The book is an aid to Biblical study, as showing that Eastern civilizations were not isolated, and did not develop separately here and there. Recent discoveries prove that about 3000 B.C. the different civilizations of Egypt, Syria, and Mesopotamia were but three branches from one common trunk, though where the trunk grew is still a matter of dispute.

A good deal has already been written on the Diaspora, its extent, the organization of the Jewish communities, their recognition by the State authorities, their rights of citizenship and social standing, and their religious and intellectual life. All these and other important questions are discussed afresh with competent scholarship in *Les Dispersés d'Israël*, by Professor A. Causse (Alcan, Paris; 166 pp., 1929). He points out that in the fifth century B.C. the Babylonian colony was the chief one, and in this connexion he cites the tablets unearthed in the ruins of Nippur by the University of Pennsylvania, as showing that the Jews were actively associated at that epoch in the social and commercial life of Babylon.[1] It was probable, he thinks, that this colony, like that at Elephantinē, possessed regular places of worship where sacrifices were offered to Yahweh, and in this sense he would interpret such texts as Is 66^{1-4}, Mal $1^{10f.}$, and Ezr 8^{16-20}. In a suggestive chapter on the interior development of Judaism, he treats of the writings of the Diaspora, and refers specially to such questions as the symbolism of Ezekiel and the Book of Job, which latter he places outside Jewish circles. He has much to say, too, on the syncretic influences which affected Jewish theology, as evidenced especially in the Apocrypha and in the doctrines of the resurrection, the future life, the angels, Satan, and the problem of evil. Altogether, Professor Causse has succeeded in giving the reader an excellent idea of the breadth and significance of the great movement which changed the face of Israel.

The Jewish wisdom literature is dealt with by Professor Paul Humbert of Neuchâtel in *Recherches sur les Sources Égyptiennes de la Littérature sapientiale d'Israël* (Neuchâtel, Secrétariat de l'Université; 153 pp., 1929). The learned author has endeavoured to trace all such literature to Egypt. It is certain, of course, that some sections of the Book of Proverbs, especially 22^{17}–23^{11}, are borrowed directly from the 'Maxims of Amenemope,' a fact first made known by Erman, and confirmed by all Egyptologists (except Budge) and all Biblical critics. But the author goes too far when he attributes all the wisdom literature, including the Books of Job, Ecclesiastes, Tobias, and 3 Esdras, and the history of Aḥiḳar, to Egypt as its principal source. The Book of Job rather manifests a Babylonian source, and even the story of Aḥiḳar has little relation to Egypt. The fact is that the Jewish writers, in producing their wisdom literature, have drawn largely upon that of all the surrounding nations, and one must not insist too much on direct analogies with one particular nation. The similarity of a few proverbs and maxims here and there cannot prove any direct dependence of the whole literature on Egypt. The book, however, is a mass of information, and abounds in interesting and striking comparisons.

Within recent years the Christian Churches have begun to devote more time to mission work among the Jews. The continued unbelief of this important race has been the subject of numerous monographs. It has been discussed, particularly in connexion with St. Paul's thoughts in Ro 9–11, by such scholars as Beyschlag, Gore, E. Weber, and lately by Dr. Fr. W. Maier (*Israel in der Heilgeschichte nach Röm. 9–11*). Those who wish a fuller treatment of the problem, historically, exegetically, and theologically, including the teaching of the Gospels and the Acts, will find it in *L'incrédulité des Juifs dans le Nouveau Testament* (J. Duculot, Gembloux, Belgium; 368 pp., 1929), by M. André Charrue, who shows a thorough mastery of the subject, an extensive scholarship, and a remarkable knowledge of contemporaneous theories. Any book must be helpful to Biblical students which deals with the important question why the Jews, whom Dr. Chalmers called 'the most illustrious people on the face of the earth,' still cling to a religion from which Christ and the New Testament are excluded.

It may not be generally known to Biblical students that Paul Sbath, the Syrian abbot of Alep, who possesses a very excellent library of Oriental manuscripts, has recently issued a catalogue of these, *Bibliothèque de Manuscrits Paul Sbath* (2 vols. of 204 and 252 pp., published by Friedrich, Cairo). In this he gives a description of 1125 manuscripts. Half of these were copied between the eleventh and sixteenth centuries, and one on parchment which goes back to the eighth century contains fragments of a Syrian 'Évangéliaire.' But the chief interest of the collection to Biblical scholars lies in the fact that it contains two new and important Arabic manuscripts of the Diatessaron, or Harmony of the Four Gospels, compiled by Tatian, the disciple of Justin Martyr. Thanks to Ciasca, we have at present two Arabic manuscripts of this famous work, but the two in possession of Paul Sbath contain variations of some importance. The first (No. 1020), which consists of 277 pp. of fifteen lines each, states that it was originally translated from Syriac into Arabic by Abu-l-Faraj, and was transcribed in 1797 by one of the servants of the Egyptian martyr Mercurios. The text commences with the Logos, Incarnation, and Childhood of Jesus, and the catalogue cites the first three verses. The second Manuscript (No. 1029), which belongs to the sixteenth century, was transcribed by Ḥanun, a Grecian minister of the gospel. It is not so much a copy of Abu-l-Faraj's translation as a new work, an independent version of Tatian's Harmony. The transcriber has altered the order of Tatian, and taken the Gospel of Matthew as the basis. The manuscript presents peculiarities of such a nature that it is likely to be nearer to the original than that of Abu-l-Faraj. One may hope that Paul Sbath will yet publish these two new manuscripts and other treasures in his collection.

---

[1] See Hilprecht, *The Babylonian Expedition of the University of Pennsylvania*, Series A, vols. ix., x.

New Testament students who are interested in the critical aspects of John the Baptist's life and work will find a comprehensive and detailed discussion in M. Goguel's *Au seuil de l'Évangile, Jean-Baptiste* (Payot, Paris; 304 pp.). The book deals principally with the historical sources from which the Evangelists have drawn their material, and on this ground the author seeks to reconstitute the various episodes in John's career, and to draw certain conclusions from the study of them. His presentation of the facts will be regarded by many as hypercritical. The whole of John's history, he holds, has been unduly subordinated by the Evangelists to that of Jesus, and his rôle reduced to that of a mere forerunner who accomplished no real work of his own. This, of course, would mean that the writers of the Gospels have, consciously or unconsciously, adapted the historical facts to their own standpoint, or allowed themselves to be imposed upon by others. This is no new theory, it is at least as old as Renan. But apart from this, the book shows outstanding scholarship and a thorough acquaintance with all the literature on the subject.

J. W. Jack.

Glenfarg.

Varia.

Dr. Vollrath put us in his debt by his recent outstanding book 'Present-day Theology in Britain,' and his present study[1] increases our indebtedness. It is designed by the author as a supplement to his book. We British people are again accounted to be cautious, shy, and practical, as contrasted with the continentals, and Dr. Vollrath indicates at length why and how Strauss got a footing among us. Our appraisement and reception of him illustrate the character of British scientific research and theology. Service for life is the predominant trait. We have little or no place for the ideal of science divorced from life.

This booklet[2] consists of lectures, and is offered as a contribution to a Christian philosophy of history. The writer sets forth his own position by a critique of that theology (the dialectic) which takes sin as its starting-point. To look upon sin, however, as an absolute fact leads, it is argued, necessarily to a demeaning of the sovereign purpose of God in human history, the reduction of Christ to a mere restorer of a Paradise lost, and the substituting, in short, of a variety of rationalistic subtilties and mythic creations for real things. Following Althaus and Hirsch among others, the author takes his stand upon 'Grace.' He stresses throughout his discussion of such themes as revelation, sin, freedom, and the Trinity, that God as the giver is the first and fundamental recognition of all true theology. Grace is prior to sin; it assumes the possibility of sin, and as recognized and misused is that which awakens our knowledge of sin and our sense of guilt. Grace has for its arena history, where all the Divine gifts proffer themselves as tasks. Adhering closely to the cosmological Christology of St. Paul the writer rounds off his discussion of the work of God in Christ as a realization, not as a restoration, where Christ as Redeemer and Reconciler is the demonstrator and inspirer of that ideal of sanctified human life which God's predestinating will has made the aim of His creative activity. The booklet is heartily to be commended, and in these mystical and mythic loving days when such great gifts as revelation are fallen into much disrepute it is a welcome antidote.

R. S. Sleigh.

Glasgow.

---

[1] *David Friedrich Strauss und seine Rezeption in Grossbritannien*, von Professor Dr. Vollrath in 'Christentum und Wissenschaft,' 1929, pp. 148–163 (Ludwig Ungelenk, Dresden; M.10).

[2] *Die Christusfrage*, von Lic. H. W. Schmidt, vi. S. 73, 1929 (Bertelsmann, Gütersloh; M.3).

Printed by Morrison & Gibb Limited, Tanfield Works,
and Published by T. & T. Clark, 38 George Street,
Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to The Editor, Kings
Gate, Aberdeen, Scotland.

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

THE cleavage within the Christian Church between the Fundamentalists and those whom, for want of a better word, we may call the liberals, must be a matter of profound regret to those members—and they doubtless represent an overwhelming majority—of both parties who recognize the indefeasible importance both of the Church and of the Bible to the spiritual life. Any effort to bridge this gulf without the compromise of intellectual sincerity is eminently worth while. Incidentally an attempt to render this service has been made by the Rev. Professor H. L. GOUDGE, D.D., Canon of Christ Church, Oxford, in his brief but thoroughly suggestive book on *The Church and the Bible* (Longmans; 4s., paper covers 2s. 6d.).

Dr. GOUDGE is well qualified to make this attempt. For while he was brought up, as he tells us, to read the Bible in the Fundamentalist way, he is nevertheless convinced that the critics are 'substantially right.' Here, then, is a man who has the necessary inner sympathy with both sides, and only such a man can help us. What has he to say?

First, let us see how far he sympathizes with the critics; for 'we shall shut our eyes,' he says, 'to nothing that the critic has to tell us.' One of those things which the critic has to tell us, and which Dr. GOUDGE admits, is that the representations of the past by Hebrew historians 'were often profoundly affected by the lessons which they wished to teach.' 'They have no scruples about mingling fiction with history, when they are using both for the same purpose. There is history in the books of Chronicles, but there is fiction also.' Again, in discussing the character of the law of Sinai, he admits that 'the narrative of Exodus is here in confusion,' and that while in Joshua the conquest of Canaan is described as rapidly effected by the Divine power, 'we have only to turn to the book of Judges to see how different was the reality.' And again, 'we have no history that we can trust for details; the historical framework (in Judges) is artificial, and some of the Judges may have been contemporaries.' No critic could ask for more. The man who could write those sentences has the right to be heard.

But here are some of his other sentences. 'If we ask what the Song of Songs means as a part of Scripture, the answer is that it sets forth the mutual love of Jehovah Incarnate and His Church,' and that, 'interpreted with restraint and reverence, it will supply us with beautiful thoughts' about the relation between Christ and His Church. Of Ecclesiastes he says that 'the book in its original form may have been nearer to the mind of Omar Khayyám than to that of Christ; but as interpreters of Scripture we are not concerned with that. Words which in themselves would bear a heterodox meaning must be interpreted in accordance with the context which the later editors have provided for them.'

Again, 'the mystical interpreters have seen in

VOL. XLI.—NO. 10.—JULY 1930.

Isaac bearing "the wood of the burnt-offering" the Lord bearing His Cross; and, if we accept the highest meaning of the story as the truest meaning, it is right to see Him there.' Again, taught by St. Paul, we shall 'find in the Red Sea Holy Baptism, and in the manna our Eucharistic food.' This type of interpretation reaches its climax when we are invited to contemplate Jonah 'giving his life for the mariners'—the mariners whose peril, as the story implies, was directly due to Jonah's own disobedience—'and passing through seeming death and resurrection to be the evangelist of the heathen world'; and what an evangelist! 'angry and displeased exceedingly' (Jon 4[1]) because the gracious God had cancelled His threat against the Ninevites upon their showing the fruits of repentance.

Here seems to speak the Fundamentalist; and the average critic will follow him, if at all, but far off and reluctantly. But to describe Dr. GOUDGE as a Fundamentalist would be to do him very much less than justice. What he is pleading for is the legitimacy not so much of the fundamentalist as of the mystical interpretation. With mystical interpretation, he assures us, historical criticism can have no quarrel. The meaning of Scripture grew with the advancing spiritual experience of the Church, and the original meaning, which it is the task of criticism to discover, by no means exhausts its meaning. Indeed, Dr. GOUDGE affirms that 'the original meaning of the words is often not their meaning as part of Canonical Scripture.'

Much of the original meaning of the ritual and ceremonial described in Leviticus is now beyond the possibility of recovery; but with that, it seems, we are not concerned. 'The true meaning is the highest meaning.' 'It is Calvary which must explain Leviticus, and not Leviticus Calvary.' It may even be that 'the unlearned Christian sometimes grasps the acquired meaning better than the scholar, since he is primarily interested in what the words mean and not in what they meant.'

This is an idea and a phrase to which Dr. GOUDGE recurs again and again: 'What Ecclesiastes meant,' he tells us, 'is one thing, and what it means is another.' In many passages where our forefathers found the Lord and the modern critic fails to find Him, 'we must ask not only what the words originally meant, but what they came to mean and should mean to us.' 'We should put upon the old words the highest meaning we can give to them.' An interpretation of the Old Testament which is not in the modern sense historical 'is none the less not only true interpretation, but for us far more valuable than the historical interpretation itself.' The Church, with its growing experience, comes to interpret old words differently from the way in which they were at first interpreted. What they once meant is one thing, but what they now mean another.

We have quoted Dr. GOUDGE at some length, because we wished to have his defence of the mystical interpretation presented with unimpeachable fairness. Is that defence convincing? There is, we must admit, a certain measure of truth in it. The great words of the Bible, as of all noble literature, grow with the deepening experience of the race, and it may readily be conceded that the writers of the Old Testament spoke better than they knew.

The critic, too, will readily admit that interpolations may have not only historical interest, but high spiritual value. The brilliant hopes that seem to be occasionally appended to the stern threats of prophecy have their own value as a revelation of the mind of God just as truly as the threats whose force they are intended to mitigate.

But one may admit all this without going all the way with Dr. GOUDGE. 'The Church,' he says, 'has always believed in mystical interpretation, and that with justice,' and at one point he even laments the neglect into which the 'typology' of Scripture has fallen. The point at which we part company with Dr. GOUDGE is this. We believe that the later meaning may be *deeper* than the original meaning; he maintains, or appears to maintain, that it may be *different*. Though essentially we may perhaps not be very far apart, there appears to be here a real and important distinction. 'The Church,' we are told, 'comes to interpret old words *differently*.' 'Hosea and others knew how to deal with the old tales, and what they mean is very *different* from what they meant' (italics ours).

Our contention is that to understand what a passage *means*, we must understand what it *meant*. If it is held to mean not only something deeper, but something different, who or what is to guarantee this later interpretation which is imported into or superimposed upon the original words? Perhaps Dr. Goudge would find this guarantee in the Spirit-led Church. But interpretation is necessarily conditioned by the intellectual atmosphere and methods of the time, and it is through these that the Spirit must work. If the methods and conclusions of one age carry no conviction to the mind of another, what then? If with the best will in the world we are unable to find in the sensuous imagery of the Song of Songs the love of Jehovah for His people or of Christ for His Church, what then? These things have their important place in the history of interpretation, but they cannot be determinative of the true meaning.

Whether one agrees or disagrees, however, with this contention, all will agree that Dr. Goudge has written a stimulating book; he has raised an important question and discussed it in a judicial and irenic spirit. He has also rendered a valuable service by reminding Catholics of the importance of the Bible, and Protestants of the importance of the Church; and his discussions are conducted with a calmness, trenchancy, fairness, and lucidity which forcibly remind us of Butler and his famous 'Analogy.'

The supplementary chapter of sixty-six pages prefixed to the recent reprint of the third edition (1923) of Dr. Charles Harris's textbook of apologetics, *Pro Fide*, does not attempt so much to solve problems as to point out where the problems lie. None the less it is a useful chapter, as at once indicating the most recent phases of apologetical discussion and introducing the reader to much of the relevant literature.

Dr. Harris begins by suggesting that the Christian apologist need not pay so much attention to *Modernism* as was desirable half a dozen years ago. In recent theology it is not the modernist but the liberal-orthodox (or critical-catholic) who has been most prominent; and the bulk of liberal thought appears to favour the liberal-orthodox rather than the definitely modernist position. The outstanding characteristic of the liberal-orthodox school, it is added, is its attempt to revive the speculative spirit of Origen, greatest of the early apologists. The veteran editor of 'Lux Mundi' may be regarded as the head of this school, and a notable exponent of it is Fr. Thornton in his recent study of the Incarnation. All this may be granted, but although the output of modernist literature may have diminished, the spirit of Modernism is still alive.

Indeed, Dr. Harris allows that there is a modified form of Monism still in much vogue to-day which is allied to Modernism on the philosophical side. He would name it *Semi-Pantheism*. What is the difference between Semi-Pantheism and Pantheism? Semi-Pantheism aims at modifying Pantheism in such a way as to render it consistent with, in particular, the Christian doctrine of creation. It is implied in a saying like this, 'Creation is the complement of God,' or this, 'The relation of God to the world is organic.' On such a theory, it is here declared, we are logically compelled to postulate the existence of some unknown 'Super-God' (something like the 'Veiled Being' of Mr. Wells) to account for the existence of God and the world.

Dr. Harris also touches upon the relations between Science and Religion, in which he notes a change for the better in recent years. The pressure of the strain between the two has been largely relieved not only by the almost universal acceptance by orthodox theologians of the Darwinian doctrine of evolution, but also by the new emphasis on the part of evolutionists upon *emergence*, by which is meant the unexplained appearance—generally in ascending series—of new qualities and values. At the present time the view that evolution is an 'emergent' process, or—in Bergson's phrase—a 'creative' process, is widely accepted not only by philosophers but also by biologists. It is capable of being harmonized with the theistic standpoint, as interpreted, for example, by Professor Lloyd Morgan.

The theory of *Relativity*, like that of Emergent or Creative Evolution, has also aroused much discussion among theistic apologists in recent years. It is not easy to say whether Relativity is intended to be taken as a philosophical theory of the actual objective structure of the physical world. If it is to be so taken, then it is of significance for religion. But religion, in Professor Eddington's opinion, has nothing to fear from it. In fact it supports the ideas of the objective existence and creative activity of God.

The chief danger to religion, as Dr. HARRIS goes on to affirm, proceeds not so much from physical science as from the extravagant claims sometimes put forward by the *New Psychology*, inasmuch as it aims at being an entirely 'natural' or experimental science, like chemistry and physics. It is with mental states as such, and not with the metaphysical nature of the soul or mind, that the 'New Psychology' is concerned. And its point of view is subjective. It is concerned, not with God, but with human ideas and beliefs about God; not with the moral law, but with man's moral ideas and sentiments. Its leading conception is that of mental activity directed towards a biological 'end' or 'purpose.' To the soul it assigns a native energy of its own (*libido* or *hormê*), which is different in kind from physical energy, and capable of directing and controlling it.

Such a psychology, as Dr. HARRIS maintains, is inconsistent with atheism, and even involves some form of theism as its philosophic basis. On the other hand, he acknowledges that certain schools of the 'New Psychology' are antagonistic to religion. *Freudianism* is usually regarded as the most antagonistic. Yet a certain number of Freudian practitioners are orthodox practising Christians, and hold that their therapeutic method (psycho-analysis) may be as useful to pastors and teachers as it is to physicians. But how do they reconcile Christianity with the pansexualism and the determinism usually associated with the Freudian psychology? There is, however, this to be added: the 'Oedipus' complex plays a much less prominent part in Freudian teaching than was formerly the case; and in Freudian practice mental therapy finds itself compelled to work on libertarian principles.

There appears to be no doubt that *Behaviourism*, which is the 'new psychology' of America, conflicts inherently and necessarily with all forms of religion. Dr. HARRIS characterizes it as a slightly Americanized version of the views of Clifford, Huxley, and Tyndall. It is a system of pure materialism based upon the assumption that man is a mindless and soulless automaton, actuated and directed entirely by physical forces. In its extreme form it denies the existence of subjective or mental states altogether. But although the Behaviourists have opened up new avenues of psychological research (their investigations of the mentality of apes may be cited), they have been losing prestige even among the experimental psychologists of America. It is being realized, for example, that an act of memory involves knowledge, not only of past facts, but also of the rememberer's soul or mind, the existence of which the Behaviourist denies.

We shall not follow Dr. HARRIS in his reference to *Christian Science*, which is so far behaviouristic in its denial of the reality of the mental state of pain; enough has been said to indicate the scope of his supplementary chapter.

'South India' is the great problem which is at present before the minds of Anglican Churchmen in this country, and raises the most drastic issues which are to be submitted to the coming Lambeth Conference of Bishops. There is hardly any book issued by leading Anglican writers which does not deal with this matter. What, then, *is* the South India problem? What are the proposals which have raised such a storm of controversy? In a book written to expound and examine these proposals, *South India Schemes*, by the Rev. W. J. Sparrow Simpson, D.D. (S.P.C.K.; 5s. net), we have the proposals set forth clearly, and a very drastic criticism of them by an earnest Anglo-Catholic.

The South India United Church was formed in 1908 by the blending together of various Congregationalist and Presbyterian Communions. Having secured this union of non-episcopal ministries, which in itself, considering their original differences, was a remarkable achievement, the South India United Church desired to extend their Union to Communions possessing an Episcopal ministry. The Indian Episcopal Church shared this desire, and in 1919 a more or less informal meeting was held between ministers of the Anglican Communion in India and the South India United Church. The Anglican members asked for the acceptance of the historic episcopate, which they explained to mean 'acceptance of the fact of Episcopacy, and not any theory of its character.'

The members of the South India United Church asked for recognition of the universal priesthood of all believers. Both sides were prepared to unite, so far as ministry is concerned, in agreement that acceptance of the fact of the Episcopate does not involve the acceptance of any theory of the origin of episcopacy, or any doctrinal interpretation of the fact. It was further agreed that the terms of union should involve no Christian community in the necessity of disowning its past, and that it was no part of their duty to call in question the validity of each other's orders.

At first it was proposed that each of the two bodies should 'commission' the ministries of the other. But this idea was soon (and finally) put aside. Two alternative proposals remained. One was that all ministers in the United Church should accept Episcopal ordination. That was never seriously urged, since acceptance of it by non-episcopal ministers would involve a disowning of their past and an agreement that their ordination had been no ordination at all. The only possibility left was to accept the ministries of all the uniting Churches. The Joint-Committee therefore recommended that the existing ministers of the three Churches, the Anglican, the South Indian (*i.e.* Presbyterian and Congregational), and the Wesleyan, should all be accepted as ministers of the Word and of the Sacraments in the Church after union. This would hold for fifty years (afterwards reduced to thirty). But at the close of this period no one should minister in the Church unless he had received regular Episcopal ordination.

This proposal, to accept both types of ministry as equally ministers of the Word and Sacraments, is explained to involve 'the practice by which members of either Church secure communion without question in the other Church, and ministers of either Church are free to invite ministers of the other Church to preside at Communion Services.' But it was also agreed that 'no minister ordained before the union shall minister temporarily in any church or congregation without the consent of the parish minister . . . any congregation accustomed to an episcopally ordained ministry will not either temporarily or permanently be placed in charge of a non-episcopally ordained minister unless all the communicant members of the congregation have been informed of the suggested appointment, and no one has signified his objection to such an arrangement.' Finally, while after thirty years all the ministers of the United Church are to be episcopally ordained, 'after this period of thirty years, the United Church will consider and decide the question of [such] exceptions to the general principle of an episcopally ordained ministry.'

No, not quite finally. There was also the important matter of Confirmation to be dealt with. And it was agreed that 'until the Synod of the Church shall frame general rules with regard to full or communicant membership, either the rite of Confirmation administered by a Bishop of the Church, or such a service of admission to full membership as was in use in the South India United Church before the union, or such a service for the recognition of new members as was in use in the Wesleyan Church in South India before the union, shall be employed in admitting persons to full or communicant membership of the United Church, and persons so admitted shall be recognized as communicant throughout the whole Church.'

These are the main features of the South India scheme, a notable and (from any point of view) courageous effort to embody the aspirations after reunion which are in the hearts of men of goodwill in all the churches. It will be obvious that the scheme is vulnerable at certain points. And Dr. Sparrow SIMPSON does not shrink from the task of exposing this. But the most momentous feature of the proposals is the challenge they present to the Church of England, and especially to the Lambeth Conference. It is not any weakness in the scheme itself as a basis of reunion that is serious. The really serious thing is that the Anglo-Catholic section of the Church of England will have nothing to do with it. This is made abundantly clear by Dr. SIMPSON in his book. He has many criticisms to offer, but the only one that matters essentially is that, if these proposals were accepted, the Anglican Church would be committing itself to the 'Protestant' theory of the ministry. To allow a non-episcopally ordained minister to celebrate the Eucharist—one, that is, who is not a priest, and who has not received his commission by Apostolic Succession from the Lord—would be an intolerable thing. The one thing that gives a priest authority to minister the Holy Supper is that he has received it by orderly succession from the Apostles, who received it from Christ Himself.

It is true that scholars like Dr. Streeter and Dr. A. C. Headlam assert that there is no evidence whatever in the New Testament for the theory of Apostolic Succession. And Dr. SIMPSON knows this, and deals with them, not very convincingly we fear, but still very honestly and fairly. He is, however, quite unmoved by their arguments. And whether they are right or not matters nothing for the present point, which is that not obscurely he hints that the acceptance of the South India scheme here may lead to a serious disruption of the Church of England. That is the issue that faces the Bishops at Lambeth. They have a difficult task set them. The whole world will watch with interest how they deal with it. And, we add very sincerely, all good men will wait and watch (and pray) with sympathy and goodwill.

◆

The Mind of Christ on Moral Problems of To-day.

VI.

War.

By the Right Reverend E. A. Burroughs, D.D.,
Bishop of Ripon.

THE difficulty of determining the mind of our Lord on any problem of a social or political nature is sufficiently indicated by the way such topics as this are discussed again and again, without even the most earnest and best-informed Christians having yet arrived at one mind. Part, at least, of this difficulty arises out of what seems to have been an aim of the whole teaching of Jesus, viz. to leave the particular application of general principles to the individual conscience. In this certainly He is followed by St. Paul, *e.g.*, in his discussion of 'meats offered to idols.' Again, the issue is always complicated by the extraordinarily different social and political conditions under which both our Lord and His early followers lived; not the least baffling difference being the fact that, under the Roman Empire, there was no such thing as public opinion in politics. The responsibility of the individual citizen for the government of his country, which to us is an axiom, would have seemed a paradox then.

No subject, perhaps, suffers so much from these limits set to modern inquiry into the mind of Jesus as that now before us—His teaching about war. Yet few are more urgently practical at the moment, when the sentiment (for it is hardly yet the conscience) of humanity is more generally alive to the importance of exorcising war than it ever has been, when the hope of success in this effort is still vivid, and when the penalties of failing to take this tide at the flood are so terrible, so certain, and so clear. The liveness of sentiment on the subject is illustrated by the immense output of 'war books,' after a period during which the late war was almost taboo to those who went through it. The absence of a real conscience about it is reflected (*e.g.*) in the vicissitudes of the Naval Disarmament Conference, and the contrast between the promise of its beginning and the very limited performance at its close. To substitute conscience for mere sentiment in such matters is the task of religious faith. Hence the urgent practical importance of any inquiry that may help to put behind our wavering pacific forces the pressure of definitely Christian conviction rather than merely humanitarian desire. It would, therefore, be immensely valuable if now at last the churches could arrive at a unanimous verdict as to the mind of our Master about war, and the consequent duty of the individual Christian.

Yet quite obviously that point, however desirable, has not yet been reached. In a recent important discussion on 'Christianity and War' by leading members of the Congregational Union, an address on 'The Teaching of Jesus' was followed immediately by two others, discussing the application of that teaching. They were described as 'the pacifist' and 'the non-pacifist' positions, and each speaker was arguing against the other. Thus even within a single denomination, and that one where, perhaps, pacifist leanings might be expected more than, say, in the Church of England, representative leaders still look different ways. So what Professor C. H. Dodd says, in opening his discussion of our Lord's teaching on that occasion, is the necessary starting-point for us as well:

> 'It is useless to look in the Gospels for such explicit teaching of our Lord about war as would set the question at rest for His followers. . . . Our study of the Gospels will not solve our concrete problems directly, but will supply a background of religious and moral principles for the discussion of these problems.' [1]

With so many other subjects before the Churches on which opinion is divided, and on which Christians are increasingly learning to agree to differ, I shall not, I hope, be expected to come down definitely myself on either the pacifist or the non-pacifist side. If I may roughly indicate my own position, as still a seeker, it is that, when I read the New Testament, it inclines me strongly to pacifism, but when I turn to the pleas of modern pacifists, I am driven rather violently the other way. Such a book, for instance, as Dr. C. J. Cadoux's admirably complete and well-documented survey of the whole field, *The Early Christian Attitude to War* (Headley Bros.), the date of which (1919) accounts largely for its predominant colour, seems to me positively dangerous to the cause which the writer has at heart. To me at least he seems to worry his evidence to death as he gives it, and to discount the surely relevant fact that some of the best and most thoughtful Christians in all ages, including our own, have been soldiers of untroubled conscience as well.

I.

To determine our Lord's mind on the subject of war is, as we have seen, peculiarly difficult because of the circumstances of His age.

On the one hand the problem as we envisage it simply does not arise. For us the question which matters is whether in any circumstances a Christian may rightly (*a*) adopt the profession of a soldier, (*b*) submit to the demands which his country may make upon any citizen for military service during a war. The second part of the question is the more serious, seeing that, as in the last war, it is almost certain that the whole able-bodied population will be involved. But our Lord lived under the *Pax Romana*—a political situation, within the Roman Empire, very like that which a successful and all-embracing League of Nations would produce in the civilized world to-day. The Roman army had virtually none but police duties (cf. the various contacts with it recorded in the New Testament), apart from those of defending the frontiers against

---

[1] *Christianity and War.* Six Addresses delivered at the Autumn Assembly of the Congregational Union of England and Wales, October 1929, p. 33. (London: Congregational Union, Inc.; price 1s.) I am much indebted to this timely booklet for help in focussing my own thought.

Barbary beyond. Augustus had advised his successors not to attempt to extend those frontiers, and this advice (Tacitus tells us) hardened into a rule. Aggression, even against barbarians, was simply not contemplated. It may have been unfortunate that soldiers and police had not yet come to be distinguished, so that society seemed to be organized on a military basis, as indeed it was. That was the meaning of 'the Empire.' But the Empire meant not war but peace; and that was why men accepted it so thankfully. If to the Jews, a recently conquered people, the presence of the Roman forces spelt repression, yet, on the other hand, the peculiar position of Judæa was recognized by the exemption of Jews, as such, from military service. Thus for the first generation of Christians our modern problem simply did not exist.

On the other hand, a specialized form of this problem touched our Lord's Jewish contemporaries closely. For in that pacified cosmopolitan world the Jews were about the only 'nationalists' in the modern sense. Hence their special privileges, accorded them by Rome, which recognized the need of peculiar treatment for a peculiar people. Incidentally, through this treatment the principle *Divide et impera* was brought to bear. For there emerged two main political parties not dissimilar to those which confront Great Britain in India to-day. The majority, including the Pharisees, accepted the *modus vivendi* with the suzerain power; but a spirit of 'non-co-operation' was endemic in the populace, and every now and then blazed into revolt. To many it was a matter of religion as well as of patriotism to have nothing to do with their Gentile rulers. Hence the interest displayed in our Lord's attitude to the question of paying tribute to Rome, and the recurrent desire of the populace to 'make him a king'—*i.e.* the leader of a nationalist revolt. (It was on the tribute question that Judas of Galilee had raised his standard some years before.) The famous reply, 'Render to Cæsar,' etc., was not just an inspired evasion and rebuke in one; it was an expression of our Lord's philosophy which at the same time gave His political views. He ranged Himself with the Pharisees on the side of non-resistance to and recognition of Roman sovereignty. But He did so in terms which showed how secondary, in His eyes, were all merely political arrangements and even grievances compared with the concerns of the Kingdom of Heaven. He would not touch on politics without bringing in religion. The same point emerges from the curious reference to the Galileans 'whose blood Pilate mingled with their sacrifices.' The political and the speculative aspects of the incident are alike swept aside. They are nothing compared with the one real issue, as He saw it: would God's people repent towards God in time? (Lk 13^{1-3}).[1]

The Jews thus had their own problem of 'non-resistance.' But clearly such incidents cannot be pressed into service as evidence bearing on that problem as it faces us. For such 'non-resistance' is wholly on another plane from that which the modern pacifist recommends. It represents political common sense rather than political idealism. It is the same attitude as St. Paul expounds more fully in Ro 13: 'Let every soul be subject to the higher powers, for the powers that be are ordained of God. . . . For this cause pay ye tribute also, for they are God's ministers, attending continually to this very thing.' Note that 'this very thing' is the avenging of evil *with violence*—'he beareth not *the sword* to no purpose.' If our Lord is to be claimed as, in the full modern sense, a 'non-resister,' He was at least inconsistent in recommending the support, by tax-paying, of a system quite openly dependent on military force. But, of course, the real point is that both He and His first followers are relatively uninterested in issues of that sort. As Lecky says, and Dr. Cadoux admits in quoting him: 'The opinions of the Christians of the first three centuries were usually formed without any regard to the necessities of civil or political life.'[2] This may partly arise from the notion that only an 'Interimsethik' was needed, instead of a complete adjustment to their social context. For the apocalyptic outlook long survived the change of emphasis revealed in the later writings of St. Paul. More likely it is due to the detachment of the plane of our Lord's thought from that on which matter-of-fact human thought was moving. 'My kingdom is not of this world.' And this detachment was encouraged in His followers by the almost complete severance, under the Empire, between the average citizen and the machinery of government. There is therefore the maximum reason for caution in converting our Lord's words to His first followers into political precepts binding on ourselves.

---

[1] Dr. Cadoux's effort to use the Pilate episode is characteristic. Our Lord, he says, 'is not anxious to exact from Pilate a penalty' for this political outrage—and this is added support for 'non-resistance'! Incidentally, it is not Pilate's guilt but that of his victims that is referred to and brushed aside.

[2] *European Morals*, ii. 39.

II.

Yet, when all this has been said, His own ideal of human relationships is unmistakable; and it is one incapable either of being realized by 'violent' means or of coexisting with a state of society based, however disguisedly, on force. Our Lord came to establish a society in which one universally valid set of human relationships would supersede all the various other groupings which complicate the world of to-day. In His divine society everything would hinge on the equal relation of all men to God as their Father in heaven. So, as St. Paul was quick to see, in the Christian society 'there can be (οὐκ ἔνι) no such distinctions as Jew or Greek, slave or free, male or female' (Gal 3[28]); and so, with this new spiritual kinship as the social goal, nothing can be right in the process of getting there which would hinder the growth of the spirit on which success depends.

Briefly, as the goal is what Harnack calls 'infinite love in ordinary intercourse,' love, not force, must be the uniform means of approach. 'The kingdom of heaven' may have to be 'taken by storm' by the moral earnestness of those who desire to enter it: but it cannot be brought nearer by force; nor can force be used to bring others into it. For force, more than anything, banishes love and stirs up antagonism and fear together. Part at least of the meaning of the third Temptation (Mt 4) is the refusal of our Lord at the very outset to use any means to win His kingdom which were inconsistent with its being the kingdom *of God*—that is, of infinite and holy love. War, therefore, can never be a Christian method of promoting any Christian cause; the chief objection to it lying not so much in the horrors and cruelties involved (cf., again, the incident of Pilate and the Galileans), but in the fact that the use of force produces psychological reactions (fear and resentment, especially) which impel to the further use of force. And this works cumulatively, leading both aggressor and victim further from the true human goal, which is love, until the process is stopped by some one who refuses to meet force with force.

This is what lies behind the whole of our Lord's familiar teaching about 'non-resistance,' in the Sermon on the Mount and elsewhere. And though, in the nature of things, He could only speak of the relations of individuals—of Christians to non-Christians, especially, in a hostile social environment—the pacifist is surely right in rejecting the plea that such teaching affects men only in their private capacity. On the one hand, 'we are all members one of another,' under whatever political conditions; and it is through the relations of individuals that society itself is gradually changed. ('Ye are the salt of the earth,' etc.) On the other hand, what reverses progress when personal relationships only are infected must do so still more seriously when communities take up the wrong mutual attitude, as in war. For to the hardening of distinctions (*e.g.* of race or class) which 'the kingdom of heaven' overrides there are added the embitterment and poisoning of masses of individual lives. If the distinctive task of the Christian is to *reverse* what seems to be the natural process,—'Be not overcome of evil, but overcome evil with good,' —*a fortiori* he must not do anything to intensify that process. And it is because 'resisting' evil, in the sense of meeting force with force, only multiplies it, while 'non-resistance' may, and often does, undermine and check it, that non-resistance is central in the programme of Christ. So far from 'doing evil that good may come,' we are to accept injury to ourselves, if need be, with a view to 'short-circuiting,' so to speak, the sway of evil in the world.

Here it is important to note the great difference between our Lord's conception of 'non-resistance' and that of the Pharisees, with whose political programme in one sense He agrees. Their acceptance of the inevitable was only political opportunism. Had successful rebellion become practical politics, they would no doubt have joined the Zealots. They shared to the full the traditional 'rancorous nationalism' of the Jew. 'This was indeed,' says Professor Dodd, 'the weakness of the Pharisees as religious guides of the nation during the last fatal half-century.' Seeing the fatal consequences of Zealotry, they 'preached non-resistance; but they did nothing to correct the inward passions which gave Zealotry its appeal.'[1] But Jesus not only differentiates His type of non-resistance by turning it into generosity: 'If your shirt is claimed by a litigant, give him your cloak too; if an official claims you as guide or porter, go with him twice as far as you are obliged.' He demands that such generosity shall have love as its source—the same indiscriminate love as God shows towards men. 'Love your enemies and pray for them that persecute you, that you may become sons of your Father which is in heaven. . . .' Only so can His kingdom come 'as in heaven, so on earth.'

In the face of this whole underlying philosophy of love, it seems pointless to discuss the few passages which are regularly quoted to rebut the fullblooded pacifist interpretation of our Lord's teaching. 'I came not to bring peace, but a sword.' 'But now (after the Last Supper: Lk 22[36]) let him that hath none sell his cloak and buy a sword,' etc. The words which seem to sweep all such counterblasts aside are those spoken to Peter still later on the night of the betrayal: 'Put back thy sword into its place, for all who take the sword shall perish by the sword' (Mt 22[52]). This is true both to human nature and to military history. 'Militarism' in any form sooner or later defeats itself, and 'the meek' do in the end 'inherit the earth.' Tertullian's comment on the passage shows that, as early as A.D. 200, when the problem of military service was already a live and growing one for Christians, some Christians at any rate saw in it a condemnation of all war: 'the Lord, in disarming Peter, ungirded every soldier' (Tert. *Idol.* 19). Dr. Cadoux is right in his claim that the growth of the Christian community depends on 'two gradual processes,' which have to 'go on *pari passu*: firstly, a gradual diminution in the number of those who use violence to restrain wrong, and, secondly, a gradual diminution in the number of those who seem to them to need forcible restraint.'[1]

---

[1] *Christianity and War*, p. 36.

And each generation proves more clearly that, man being what he is, the child of God, moral influences can do more and better things with him than force. It is the truth dimly foreshadowed in Æsop's fable of the sun and the wind, and clearly stated in an Eastern proverb: 'Hatred ceaseth not by hatred at any time, hatred ceaseth only by love.'

Admittedly, then, no Christian as such, and no Christian society as such, could ever consistently resort to war as a means to any Christian end; and, if an end is not Christian, it is not for the Christian, as such, to seek it. It is difficult in these days to imagine any Church, except possibly the one which has so often done so in the past, and which has lately regained its 'temporal sovereignty,' using again the weapons of the world or the 'secular arm' in the supposed interest of the Kingdom of God. When Dr. Cadoux criticises non-pacifist Christians as 'realizing the impossibility of finding any sanction for war in the Gospels' and yet 'clinging to the belief that war is *in these days a Christian duty*'[2] he simply confuses the issue, if indeed he realizes what it is.

No modern Christian, especially with the experience of the last fifteen years before him, could think of 'war in these days as a Christian duty.' But many Christians realize that, the world being still what it is, the admittedly sub-Christian society to which, as citizens, they belong, may, as part of the entail of evil from the past, find itself involved in a situation in which *its* duty, in the sense of the least objectionable of the courses open to it, might once more seem to be to take up arms, as Belgium and Great Britain did in 1914. And then the Christian individual would have to ask himself whether by co-operation or abstention he could best promote his Master's interests: a point which, as we have seen, cannot be settled simply by his Master's recorded words. If he decided to serve as a soldier, he would not be 'clinging to the belief that war is a Christian duty': he would (assuming his decision to be honest and conscientious) be merely taking up his own cross and bearing his own share of the piled-up sin of the world. And so, too, would the truly conscientious objector be doing.

III.

So we come to the burning practical problem which so exercises the world to-day, and which every Christian has to be ready to solve in practice for himself if another war comes. Has the time arrived for the ideal which shines out from our Lord's whole philosophy to be treated as every Christian's hard-and-fast rule? And if we cannot lay down the law for every Christian in every situation, how is the individual to decide for himself, as Christ apparently wills him to do?

The application of the Christian ideal in particular circumstances would appear to depend mainly on three things:

(1) the stage of ethical development at which the whole society concerned has arrived;
(2) the moral and spiritual illumination of the individual Christian whose decision is called for; and
(3) the interests of the Christian cause, viewed as objectively as, in the circumstances, an individual can, and (that it may be so) looked at in company with the Christian body itself.

Brief comment on these three principles must suffice.

(1) What is admittedly an absolute rule for and within the Christian community may be one which, in a sub-Christian society, Christians cannot literally apply without failing in their equally admitted duty to the larger community to which they also belong. There will always be the question, which

---

[1] Cadoux, *op. cit.*, p. 43.
[2] *Op. cit.*, p. 45.

in fact was asked in first-century Rome, 'Can a good Christian be a good citizen as well?' And here our Lord, with His 'Render unto Cæsar . . .,' brings, not the peace of a ready-made answer, but the sword of repeated personal decisions.

It is true that in A.D. 66, when the Jews did at last revolt from Cæsar, the Jewish Christians, acting, as they believed, on our Lord's advice to 'flee to the mountains,' withdrew to a Gentile city and took no part in the campaign (cf. Lk 21^{20-24}). For some it must have been very hard to become 'conscientious objectors' in this way; but others must equally have realized that already the centre of gravity of the Christian world had shifted from Jerusalem to Rome, and that to identify themselves still with Jewish nationalism would have been not merely suicidal but unfaithful to Christ. And anyhow 'Submit yourselves . . . unto the king (the emperor) as supreme' (1 P 2) was an apostolic injunction. Thus the attitude of the Jewish Christians towards the invasion of Vespasian offers no guidance relevant, say, to the problem that faced Belgian Christians in August 1914.

It is equally true that, by the end of the second century, it was becoming increasingly usual for Christians to enter the imperial forces, quite apart from the conversion of soldiers: which proves that, so far, military service had not come to be regarded by the Church as *ipso facto* inconsistent with the Christian profession. Tertullian, who (as we have seen) was himself anti-militarist, tells the story of the 'Thundering Legion' in the reign of Marcus Aurelius, and shows that many were taking up soldiering in his day. What put him against the practice seems rather to have been the pagan incidentals of service than the essential conditions of army life; and so again his testimony decides nothing. In the course of the third century the number of Christian soldiers must have multiplied greatly, to judge by the number of military martyrs. And these martyrdoms themselves attest that it was no slackness of conscience or inconsistency that led such men to serve. More probably, in view of the dangers threatening the Empire and all that it stood for in the world, their presence in the armies represents a conscientious attempt to go on 'rendering unto Cæsar' in so far as Cæsar would at the same time let them 'render unto God.'

When one remembers how St. Paul accepts without question the institution of slavery, even in Christian households—merely premising that the Christian slave of a Christian owner (like Onesimus after his return) will be treated as a brother beloved, and will act in the same way by his master; when one finds him apparently indifferent as to whether a slave, on his conversion, shall or shall not try to become free, though he deprecates a freeman selling himself into slavery (cf. 1 Co 7^{20-24}); it is difficult not to picture him, *in the then state and organization of society*, saying much the same of military service. 'Wast thou called as a soldier? Do not worry about it. And even if thou hast a chance of escaping, it may be better to use the opportunities of that state of life.' (The Greek of $v.^{21}$ is, of course, ambiguous.)

But is the same attitude *still* consistent with Christianity now? That is the real point. There came a time when slavery stood self-condemned before a gradually awakened and educated Christian conscience; and then slavery had to go. The abolitionists had to fight for their principles; but those principles are now taken for granted by the civilized world. Some day war will be in the same position. And some of the abolitionists in this field—the pacifists of to-day—will have to assert their convictions and gradually drive out what they regard as the opportunism of the rest. But has that time come? Could the abolition of slavery have been effected even in England before the Evangelical Revival? If public opinion had not been fairly ripe for conversion, would the abolitionists have effected anything by merely manumitting all their own slaves, and refusing dividends earned in part by slave labour? If public opinion is not yet ripe for a complete renunciation of war in any circumstances whatsoever—and that is what pacificism involves—are the convinced Christians of our own generation a strong enough force to convert it merely by refusing *en masse* (supposing that we could all come to one mind and conscience on the subject) to take up arms in any circumstances themselves? Unquestionably a *really united* Christian refusal would have an effect out of all proportion to the numbers involved. But is there any present prospect of a united protest—which, in this case above all, means an international as well as a pandenominational one? And if not, would the Church really be wise to preach pacifism, in the professional sense, as part of the duty of every Christian, when she cannot prove that either our Lord or the New Testament writers, or those of the first Christian centuries, went so far?

What we all can do and must do is (*a*) to live right up to the stage of enlightenment actually reached, and part with the world at once if it tries to move backwards, and (*b*) to use every means to 'press on unto perfection' and lead the community to the next higher stage, with the Mind of Christ as the test and goal of progress. And here it should be obvious that what was consistent with Christian duty in 1914–18 need not necessarily be so in the case of 'the next war.' For one thing, the world has learned much about the futility of war, of its inevitably debasing effects on character except when there is the saving grace of Christ, and of its incalculable by-products in the form of both economic and psychological dislocation and misery. We also know now that war in the twentieth century is infinitely more terrible and less capable of idealization, as well as vaster in its sweep, than war in any previous age, and that the next war, if it comes, will be immeasurably worse than the last. And we know that, if 'the war to end war' does have a successor, human nature will go into it ashamed and humiliated and paralysed by self-despair, so that such a war will have even less chance of doing good indirectly than the last war, of which so much was hoped at the time.

Above all, we know that, through the only good by-product of that war so far apparent in the moral and political sphere—the recognition of all-round international obligations, limiting the sovereignty of every self-respecting state, enshrined in the Covenant of the League of Nations and the Pact for the Renunciation of War as an instrument of policy—no new war can break out under at all the same conditions as the old. Practically every possible belligerent is a signatory of the Covenant or of the Pact, or of both. It will be the duty of Christian citizens of such countries to inquire whether their Government of that day is faithfully fulfilling its obligations. Precipitate action of any sort will be *prima facie* evidence of bad faith. And here, so far from evading responsibility with the old immoral yet intelligible cry, 'My country right or wrong,' it will (I submit) be the duty not of Christians only but of every patriot, for the sake of his country's political honour as well as of the principles of Jesus Christ, to refuse his support of or acquiescence in any warlike act which has not been preceded by an honest and patient effort to use all the existing machinery for peaceful settlement. In other words, there is a far greater likelihood of the Churches having to point and follow the way of 'conscientious objection' in any future war than ever in the past.

The stage of development reached so far, and the Christian obligations consonant with it, seem to me to be admirably registered in the unanimous Resolution passed in September 1929 at Avignon by the International Management Committee of the 'World Alliance for Promoting International Friendship through the Churches,' and since then adopted by the British Council of the Alliance. (The Alliance represents the Christian Churches, other than the Roman Church, of thirty-one nations, and the British Council has the same scope in Great Britain and Ireland.)

1. We whole-heartedly welcome the solemn declaration made by the leading statesmen of the world in the names of their respective peoples that they condemn recourse to war for the solution of international controversies, renounce it as an instrument of national policy in their relations with one another, and agree that the settlement or solution of all disputes or conflicts, of whatever nature or of whatever origin they may be, which may arise among them, shall never be sought except by pacific means.
2. We believe that war considered as an institution for the settlement of international disputes is incompatible with the mind and method of Christ, and therefore incompatible with the mind and method of His Church.
3. While convinced that the time must come for the revision of existing treaties in the interests of peace, we maintain that all disputes and conflicts between nations, for which no solution can be found through diplomacy or conciliation, ought to be settled or solved through arbitration, whether by the World Court or by some other tribunal mutually agreed. For this purpose we desire the immediate completion of such organizations as will provide means for pacific settlement of every kind of international dispute and will enthrone justice among all peoples.
4. We earnestly appeal to the respective authorities of all Christian communions to declare in unmistakable terms that they will not countenance, nor assist in any way in, any war with regard to which the Government of their country has refused a *bona fide* offer to submit the dispute to arbitration.

The next step before the churches now would seem to be to make such declarations as § 4 envisages, and to start educating their members for action along such lines. Here pacifists and non-pacifists can surely join forces. It is interesting to note that, at an International Youth Conference held in Switzerland under the auspices of the World Alliance, only three weeks before the Avignon meeting, the young people, after a preamble in caustic terms condemning the Churches for failure in their duty during the late war and since, urged them to define their attitude towards war in the terms originally adopted by the 'Copec' Conference of 1924:

> 'That the Churches should unreservedly condemn, and refuse to support in any way, a war waged before the matter in dispute has been submitted to an arbitral tribunal, or in defiance of the decision of such a tribunal.'

This suggests that there is at present a risk of Christians lagging even behind the politicians, just as the politicians are apt in practice to shirk the consequences of documents to which they have set their hands. At the least it is the duty of the Christian community, as such, to refuse to fall below the existing high-water mark of political theory, and to satisfy themselves, before joining in any conflict, that their country really did use all provided means of avoiding it. Then, having got the existing high-water mark really respected, we shall have to go on to force it higher.

IV.

Much shorter treatment must suffice for the other two considerations on which, as has been previously suggested, the application of the Christian ideal must depend: viz. (2) the moral and spiritual illumination of the individual Christian called on to decide, and (3) the interests of the Christian cause itself, viewed as objectively as possible.

Under (2), the ruling principle would seem to be two-sided. First, 'let every man be fully persuaded in his own mind.' A really conscientious and whole-hearted acceptance of an intrinsically lower ideal may be more 'Christian' than an artificial or 'second-hand' adhesion to an intrinsically higher. No one would defend the coward who pleaded 'conscientious objection.' But it might be better for one who suspected that his own 'objection' was really cowardice to take up *the other* cross, by enlisting, rather than remain 'of doubtful mind.' Refusal to fight in a case where (*ex hypothesi*) the fighting has been forced on one's country, on the ground that one had been brought up to pacifism, would also, I think, be indefensible. One would have to be personally convinced that to fight is inevitably wrong; and in this case a man's duty would be clear—to prove his conviction by acting on it. But, secondly, 'Who art thou that judgest another man's servant? to his own master he standeth or falleth.' St. Paul's handling of 'conscience' in the matter of 'meats offered to idols' is apt guidance for the parallel here. Just as the real 'conscientious objector' must never be penalized, so neither must he say to his brother who fights: 'I have a Christian conscience, and you have not.' Yet, though each must be free from the other's conscience, he must perpetually bring his own to the touchstone of the mind of Christ.' 'Jesus brings us into conflict with social duties to which we all wish to cling.'[1] When the world has already moved so far towards outlawing war, it cannot but become increasingly difficult for any instructed Christian to undertake to fight with anything like 'full persuasion in his own mind': and the more he knows of the mind of Christ, the harder it is likely to be.

(3) At the same time, even the most convinced, either way, will have to remember that 'none of us liveth unto himself.' In other words, individual conviction must still be related, if not subordinated, to the good of the Christian whole. A Christian has to consider not only the effect on his own conscience, say, of his consenting to fight, but the effect of either consent or refusal on the good name of the Christian Church. 'I do all things with an eye to the gospel,' says St. Paul; and it is at least arguable that a general outburst of Christian pacifism might do more to thwart the gospel than the continued participation of Christians in war. 'Submit yourselves to every ordinance of man *for the Lord's sake*; whether it be to the king as supreme . . .' That surely covered military service then; and, if it were in the Lord's interests for Christians not to stand apart from the rest of the nation they belong to, it would cover it now. Perhaps the maximum of self-crucifixion would be reached by the man who, himself a real conscientious objector, decided to fight after all, lest conscientious objection on his part should prejudice the appeal of his Master to his fellow-men. The Jews could afford to be known and treated as a 'peculiar people,' with special exemptions. But as such they could never have evangelized the world. The Christian, with his primary task of getting alongside and winning others, cannot afford to erect a barrier of misunderstanding between himself and them by seeming to refuse crosses which they have to bear, even though he claim to be bearing a greater.

The conclusion of the whole matter I cannot put better than in some words of Mr. George Shillito in the booklet to which I have so often referred:

---

[1] William Herrmann, *Essays on the Social Gospel*, Eng. tr., p. 163 (quoted by Cadoux).

> 'Through a slowly clarifying inward vision we move to moral capacity . . . Striving towards right decisions, men and nations become great,—
> "Life's business being just the terrible choice."
> . . .
> 'There are no short cuts out of the embarrassment created by ages of human sin, and ignorance, and catastrophe. . . .
> 'The task to which we are called is not the melodramatic and impossible performance of downing arms, but a wise, persistent, whole-hearted evangelisation of all the nations of the world.'[1]

---

[1] *Christianity and War*, pp. 59–60.

National Contributions to Biblical Science.

IV. The Contribution of Germany to Church History: Ancient Church and Reformation.

By Professor James MacKinnon, Ph.D., D.D., Edinburgh.

I.

Germany's contribution to the literature of Church History is very extensive, and in two short articles one can only indicate its main content and characteristics. Even so, considerations of space have compelled the writer to limit this survey to the two most formative periods of Church History—those of the rise and development of the Catholic Church and of the Reformation.

In their treatment of Church History the Germans display no little initiative in the formulation of problems and theories relative to the subject-matter of the various periods. The discussion of these problems and theories has stimulated inquiry and has contributed to a fresh elucidation of a given theme or movement. The old method of the academic disputation has been transferred from the rostrum to the study and the press, and has expressed itself in the controversial tone of many works in all departments of German science, and not least in that of Church History. The contentious, doctrinaire spirit is at times unduly obtrusive. The method has thus its drawbacks inasmuch as the subjective element, as revealed in individual temperament and conviction, is apt to affect the objective treatment of the subject in question. As in other departments of scientific activity, it has left, as a memorial of misdirected effort, a bulky record of exploded or greatly modified theories. For instance, the Tübingen theory of the early development of Christianity under the influence of the Jewish-Christian and the Pauline-Gentile antithesis, resulting in the synthesis of the Fourth Gospel, which is assigned to the second half of the second century. On the whole, however, the method has substantially contributed to the advancement of historical knowledge.

The Germans are strong in textual criticism. They have long realized the importance of correct texts, and have devoted immense learning and labour to the production of critical and competently annotated editions of the sources of the various epochs of Church History—particularly those of the Ancient Church and the Reformation. Equally admirable is their application of the critical spirit in the exposure of the unauthentic material in which certain periods of Church History abound. They have, further, grasped the fundamental truth that Church History is not an isolated phenomenon and can only be adequately elucidated in relation to the general history of the time. In the early period, for instance, the development of Christian thought and institutions was largely influenced by Hellenism and the constitution of the Roman Empire, and the more recent German historical literature shows ample evidence of the comprehension of this cardinal fact.

The German contribution to Church History in recent times also reveals the striving to apply to this department of investigation the same scientific method as is observed in the treatment of secular history. There is apparent the same effort to use only critically sifted sources and to differentiate, in the scientific spirit, between fact and belief. The dogmatic method of writing Church History has thus tended, in increasing degree, to give place to the factual and scientific one except in the case of those, particularly of the extreme Roman Catholic persuasion, who still write from the dogmatic standpoint that the history of the Church, as ruled by the papacy, is the history of an infallible institution which has never essentially erred and cannot, in fact, do so.

Very remarkable is the number of German Church historians who have attempted a survey of the whole course of Christian history or covered a large part of it. Among these general histories the Lehrbuch or Compendium of Gieseler is still useful in virtue especially of its copious quotations from the sources. The same claim may be made for Hase's compilation. It is also still worth while to consult the more voluminous work of Neander, which extends down to the fifteenth century and, under Schleiermacher's influence, combines deep religious feeling with intimate knowledge of the sources. Baur's masterly survey, especially of the early period, gave a great stimulus to the studies of other writers and on this account has also to be reckoned with. Among the general histories written from the Roman Catholic point of view the works of Alzog, Schmidt, Hergenröther in the recent revision of Kirsch, Funk (recently revised by Bihlmeyer) are the most outstanding. Among more recent Protestant writers the handbooks of Kurtz and Moeller have had a wide circulation both in the original German and in English translations. They are, however, being superseded by fresh surveys like those of K. Müller, Achelis, Heussi, von Schubert, and the Handbook by various writers edited by Gust. Krüger, who, along with Preuschen, has contributed the first part on the Ancient Church. K. Müller's work, which reaches the seventeenth century, remains the standard guide in German for the student of general Church History, and it is regrettable that it has not hitherto found an English translator. Mirbt's collection of documents relative to the papacy and Roman Catholicism (1924) is a handy guide to the more important sources.

Turning now to the distinctive epochs of Church History, the Germans have produced a great amount of original work on the Primitive Church. For this period the New Testament writings are the primary sources, and in the critical treatment of these for historical purposes they have taken both the initiative and the leading part. Weizsäcker's work on the *Apostolic Age* (Eng. tr., 1894) is still valuable, and Wernle's *Beginnings of Christianity* (Eng. tr., 1903–04) is brilliant, whilst Pfleiderer (*Urchristenthum*, 1902) and Knopf's *Nachapostolische Zeitalter* (1905) still deserve the attention of the student. Wernle's 'Jesus und Paulus'[1] is a forcible refutation of Bousset's contention (*Kyrios Christos*, 1913) that Paul's Christianity was largely derived from Hellenist sources. Indispensable is the *Urchristenthum* of J. Weiss (1915), which reviews the origins with an illuminating erudition and charm of style. The latest contribution—that of Schlatter—(*Geschichte der ersten Christenheit*, 1927), which dispenses with critical notes, rather disappoints the inquiring student. Poland (*Griechische Vereinswesen*, 1909) is a valuable aid to the discussion of the question of the influence of the Guilds and Fraternities of the Græco-Roman world on the organization of the early Christian community. On the constitution of the early Church, Sohm's *Kirchenrecht* (i. 1892), Loening's *Die Gemeinde Verfassung des Urchristenthums* (1889), and Harnack's *Entstehung der Kirchenverfassung* (1910, Eng. tr. 1910) are of great value. Harnack is at issue with Sohm, who maintains that the primitive community, as a purely spiritual body, was not, and could not, be an organized association in the legal sense, with functionaries possessing a recognized authority in virtue of their office. Against this extreme Lutheran spiritualism, Harnack emphasizes with no little force the authoritative position of the Twelve and other functionaries in the community. He is less successful in an attempt, under the influence of Hatch, to differentiate between the offices of presbyter and bishop, whom he transforms into an administrative functionary. His thesis has not been generally accepted, and the identity of these functionaries may still be said to be the established view. The Christian life of the early community has been admirably depicted by Dobschütz (*Christian Life in the Primitive Church*, Eng. tr., 1904). In connexion with this subject it is advisable to consult Friedländer's *Sittengeschichte Roms* (Eng. tr. from the seventh German edition, under the title *Roman Life and Manners under the Early Empire*).

Passing to the Ancient Catholic Church and its development during the first four centuries, German scholars have rendered sterling service in the critical treatment of this lengthy period, on which the discovery of lost documents (the Didache, the Apology of Aristides, the Acts of Paul, certain writings of Irenæus, Hippolytus, Methodius, Priscillian, Nestorius, etc.) has thrown new light. For an introduction to the earlier part of this literature the student is greatly indebted to Harnack's *Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur* (1893) and his *Chronologie* (1904–07), and to Bardenhewer's volumes on the same subject (1902–24), and that of Schanz-Krüger for the Latin writers. To the Vienna Academy we owe the series of Latin Ecclesiastical Writers (*Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum* from 1866 onwards); to the Prussian Academy the series of Greek writers (from 1897 onwards), which includes Schwartz's standard edition of the Ecclesiastical History of Eusebius and competent editions of Theodoret, Gelasius, Philostorgius, and Epiphanius. The long series of *Texte und Untersuchungen*, corresponding to the English *Texts and Studies*, provides a varied repertory of studies of particular writers and themes. Valuable contributions to the elucidation of the period are also to be found in the various German theological journals and the numerous *Festschriften* in honour of distinguished German theologians. As an example of the critical study of groups of writers stand out the edition of the Apostolic Fathers by Gebhardt, Harnack, and Zahn, (1877–78) and Funk's handy collection of these writings (1906). The number of monographs on individual writers is almost bewildering, and it must suffice to mention Zahn on Ignatius (1875) and Hermas (1868), Harnack on the Didache (1886), Baumeister on the Ethik of Hermas (1912), Bonwetsch on the Theology of Irenæus (1925), Loofs on Paul of Samosata (1924). Böckh's *Corpus Inscriptionum Graecarum* includes a collection of Christian inscriptions, which Mommsen has almost entirely excluded from the *Corpus Ins. Lat.*

---

[1] *Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche* (1915).

Recent systematic works of value on the period are available in those of Achelis (*Christenthum der ersten drei Jahrhunderte*, 1912), Haase (*Altchristliche Kirchengeschichte nach orientalischen Quellen*, 1925), von Soden (*Geschichte der christlichen Kirche*, 1919). The older works of Baur (*Das Christenthum und die christliche Kirche der ersten drei Jahrhunderte*, 1860, Eng. tr. 1878) and A. Ritschl (*Entstehung der altkatholischen Kirche*, 1857) are important for the stimulus imparted to other historians. Ritschl took the initiative in the reaction against the distinctive standpoint of Baur, who, under the influence of the Hegelian philosophy, built his work on the very questionable assumption of the long-drawn-out antithesis between Jewish-Christian and Pauline Christianity. In the department of the History of Dogma the more recent works of Harnack, Seeberg, Loofs, and Dorner are of capital importance. Those of Harnack and Loofs belong to the Liberal School. Harnack in his detailed and masterly exposition frankly recognizes the decisive influence of Hellenist thought, which gradually moulded ecclesiastical doctrine and, in the acute form of this influence, found expression in Christian Gnosticism. Hence what he calls the secularization or Hellenization, in varying degree, of Christian thought throughout the period preceding the General Councils of the fourth and fifth centuries, whose history has been minutely, though not always objectively recounted by the Roman Catholic, Hefele (*Concilien Geschichte*², 1877). This contention is substantially founded. Its influence is already apparent, indeed, in the Fourth Gospel, though Harnack recognizes that it forms only one element in the development of ancient Catholic thought, which in its own subjective fashion sought to embody and preserve the evangelical-Apostolic traditions. Roman Catholic writers like Ehrhard, on the other hand, repudiate such influence, and very hazardously maintain the Divine character of the developing Catholic Church as 'the genuine fruit of primitive Christianity' (*Urchristenthum und Katholicismus*, 1925). For the Protestant Sohm, on the contrary, who approaches the subject from the constitutional point of view, it is a complete aberration from the primitive model (*Wesen und Ursprung des Katholicismus*, 1912).

The study of the Gnostic movement both as a system of thought and in its influence—positive and negative—on the Catholic Church, to which Harnack's thesis gave an impulse, has entered on a new phase in works like Bousset's *Hauptprobleme der Gnosis* (1907), the first volume of Müller's *Kirchengeschichte* and the 'Beiträge zum Verständnis der valentinianischen Gnosis,'[1] Schmidt's edition of *Pistis Sophia* (1925), Harnack's *Marcion* (1921), Leisegang's *Gnosis* (1924), and the older work of Anz, *Zur Frage nach dem Ursprung des Gnosticismus* (1897). For the contemporary but widely different anti-ecclesiastical movement known as Montanism, the work of Bonwetsch (*Geschichte des Montanismus*, 1881) is still the standard one in German.

On the Christian mission in the Græco-Roman world Harnack opened up a new perspective in his *Mission und Ausbreitung des Christenthums in den ersten drei Jahrhunderten* (fourth edition, 1924, Eng. tr. by Moffatt), in which, improving on Neander, he luminously, if not exhaustively, reviewed the subject from the relative evidence. The book has also had the merit of fostering inquiry, outside as well as within Germany, into this hitherto largely neglected, but highly important branch of Church History. Much labour has, on the other hand, been expended on the long, if intermittent, persecution of the Christians to which the Christian mission gave rise, and on the relation of the Ancient Church and the Empire. Mommsen led the way to a truer conception of the early persecutions in his article in the *Historische Zeitschrift* on 'Der Religionsfrevel nach römischen Recht,' though his thesis, that the earlier persecution was purely a matter of the police jurisdiction of the local magistrate, not of State ordinance, has recently been subjected to some criticism—by O. Sild, for instance, in *Das altchristliche Martyrium* (1920) and Heinze in *Tertullian's Apologeticum* (1910).

---

[1] *Nachr. Gott. Ges. Wiss.*, 1920.

Recent writers like Geffcken (*Das Christenthum im Kampf mit der Griechischen-Römischen Welt*, 1920), Schönaich (*Kämpfe zwischen Römertum und Christenthum*, 1927), Stade on the Diocletian Persecution (1926), Knipfing on the Edict of Milan (1922), have made substantial contributions which have superseded the older works of Uhlhorn (1879), Wieseler (1878), and Linsenmayer (1905). Schiller's *Geschichte der Römischen Kaiserzeit* (1883) is also helpful for the attitude of the various emperors. In this connexion the works of the Apologists and their opponents have been the object of intensive study. Among the large number of valuable monographs it must suffice to mention those of Geffcken (*Zwei Griechische Apologeten*), of Wehofer (1897), Engelhardt (1878) and Flemming (1883), on Justin Martyr; Schwartz on Athenagoras; Keim (1873), Glöckner (1924), and Stange (1926) on Celsus and Origen; Schmidt on Plotinus in relation to Christianity (1901), Harnack on Porphyry (1916). The more notable of the general works dealing with the fall of Paganism are those of Schulze (*Geschichte des Untergangs des G.-R. Heidenthums*), especially of Seeck (*Geschichte des Untergangs der antiken Welt*, 1895–1920), whose estimate of Christianity has been sharply criticised by Krüger.[1]

The development of the ecclesiastical constitution has been the object of much inquiry and discussion in the works on *Kirchenrecht* (Sohm, Harnack, Bickell, Loening, etc.), and in the monographs on parts of the subject. Among the latter are important contributions like Zahn's *Ignatius*, Harnack's edition of the Original Sources of the Apostolic Canons in *Texte und Untersuchungen*, ii. (Eng. tr. by Wheatley, 1895), Döllinger's *Hippolytus und Kallistus* (tr. by Plummer, 1876), Rolffs' 'Kallistus' (*Texte und Unters.* xi. 1893), O. Ritschl (1885) and Goetz (1896) on Cyprian, Schwartz's *Kaiser Konstantin und die Christliche Kirche* (1913) and the *Acta Conciliorum oecumenicorum* (1914 f.). A systematic discussion in German of the influence of the organization and administration of the Roman Empire on the development of the ecclesiastical constitution is still, as far as I know, a desideratum. On the other hand, there is a considerable amount of recent literature on the Roman Primacy, which is elucidated by Grill (*Primat des Petrus*, 1904), Schnitzer (*Hat Jesus das Papsthum gestiftet?*, 1910), Caspar (*Primat des Petrus*, 1927), Lietzmann (*Petrus und Paulus in Rom*, 1927), in which the burning questions of the authenticity and interpretation of Mt 16$^{18. 19}$ and the sojourn of Peter in Rome, etc., are discussed.

In other departments of Ancient Church History it must suffice to mention the meritorious contributions to the early history of monasticism of Weingarten (1877), Reitzenstein (1914), Bousset (1923), Crum and Ehrhard (1915), Laun (1925), Peradse (1927). On church life, discipline, and worship those of Lucius, *Anfänge des Heiligenkults*, edited by Aurich (1904), Adam's, Poschmann's, and Brewer's expositions of the ecclesiastical remission of sins, Holl's essay on 'Fasts in the Ancient Greek Church,' that of Kalsbach on the institution of the office of deaconess, Preisker and K. Müller on marriage. On the liturgy of the Ancient Church see the recent works of Dölger, Schermann, Lietzmann, Völker, Baumstark, and Mohlberg. Ecclesiastical archæology has also received additions from Kaufmann (*Handbuch der Christlichen Archäologie*, 1922), Schultze (*Grundriss der Christ. Archäologie*, 1919), Wulff (*Die alte Christ. Kunst*, 1917), v. Sybel (*Frühchrist. Kunst*, 1920), Beyer (*Die Katakombenwelt*, 1927). Culture and education in Christian Antiquity have been treated by von Schubert (1925).

(*To be continued.*)

◆

---

[1] *Die evangelische Theologie, 3te Theil: Die Kirchengeschichte*, 31–32 (1928).

Literature.

CHRISTIAN ETHICS.

The Hulsean Lecture has been thrown open to scholars of communions other than the Church of England; and, aptly enough, the first of these to be invited was Dr. C. A. Anderson Scott, who was also the first of them to be given the D.D. by the University of Cambridge. That it was a wise choice all will heartily agree who read the scholarly and thought-provoking lectures in their printed form. Dr. Scott has boldly chosen to deal with what is moving more and more into the centre of the field. A few more books like his *New Testament Ethics* (Cambridge University Press; 5s. net), and the old and silly gibe at works on Christian ethics as unreadable, or out on the circumference of things, will die of ridicule. Short and professedly elementary though it is, this is so obviously first-hand work, based on such careful study of the sources, that it keeps flashing fresh suggestions on the mind. Three chapters on the Master's teaching, two upon Paul's ethical passages, and one other on the problems of to-day—that sounds quite usual and simple. Yet this is the livest of books. On every page it stops one, and demands attention. Christ is no legislator. What He gives us is a spirit. Indeed (falling back on the old distinction between *mandata* and *consilia*), there is only one 'commandment issued on His bare authority,' the law of love, and various applications of it. And even about taking all of these too literally our Lord Himself expressly warned us with an unusual note of sadness, not to say of sharpness, in His voice, as being nothing less than spiritual obtuseness. Of sin Christ may say little, but He has intensified its horror past all calculation. What He means by sin is an inquiry which leads Dr. Scott into some fascinating studies. Vindictiveness, he feels, seems to our Lord to be most fatal; and, in passing, he underlines how little Jesus is concerned about the man who needs forgiveness, how He concentrates upon the other and what will he make of it? Vindictiveness and possessiveness—πλεονεξία, which he translates insatiableness. Others are ὑπερηφανία, translated as despising others; βλασφημία, injurious speech, not so much against God, as men; ἀφροσύνη, moral insensibility; and hypocrisy, 'failure to think out the practical application of one's religious principles in one's relations with men.' Positively, there is little independent detail in Christ's picture of a good man. There are the Beatitudes—the meek, for instance, 'those who make no claim, but cast themselves upon the mercy of God.' But two general maxims stand out clearly. 'Do not press for your rights,' and 'Do more than your duties, and do them in a different spirit.'

As to the Apostle, what strikes our author is how marvellously he did really have the mind of Christ even on such new and original things as our Lord's teaching upon sexual morality, or on His underlining of caring for others as the master-key to all the problems of social relationship and the like. Some bold pages argue that even on the Law, Master and pupil were at one; which may, perhaps, be conceded. But one is not a little staggered when, in dealing with the differences between Paul's mind and Christ's, it is emphatically argued that on Divine forgiveness Christ is forensic in a way that Paul is not, and that in some respects the Apostle 'apparently advances beyond the Master.' This simply cannot be proved, and the attempt to do so leaves one wholly unconvinced.

What kind of motives did Paul stress, and what standards did he set before his people, and how did he apply his Master's teaching to the circumstances that confronted him? Themes such as these bring us to the last chapter, on what we must do with Jesus' teaching that it may be vital and sufficient for the problems of our time. An interesting, fresh, impressive book.

THE PROBLEM OF PAIN.

To every generation, because ultimately to every human heart, the supreme enigma of undeserved suffering presents itself in some form or other. This it is which makes the Book of Job one of enthralling interest to the reflective mind. It contains within itself the challenge to belief in an all-wise God which adversity makes to the truly good man. This great drama presented by the ancient Hebrew author is dealt with in *The Problem of Pain*, by Professor J. E. McFadyen, D.D. (James Clarke; 6s. net), the third edition of which is just published.

Dr. McFadyen has, with admirable literary tact, set this old and moving story in a new light. Without entering into wearisome discussion concerning the form of 'Job,' he presents it to us as a drama complete with prologue, acts, and epilogue. The arrangement proves advantageous to the reader, since alike on our minds and our hearts, the intellectual and spiritual impact of the whole through the increased clearness of the parts is greatly enhanced.

Moreover, all the implications of the characters are more easily grasped. Dr. McFayden does not permit us to rest in the belief that Job's friends are merely repeating each other in their various statements of the traditional view of suffering as retributive. They, all four, hold this belief, yet, as Dr. McFadyen elicits for us all the nuances of character which lie behind their different expressions of it, our interest is caught and held by the power and truth of the exposition. We are made to feel, in the interplay of these individual minds with that of the hero, the real titanic quality of Job's spirit. As he combats their assertive complacency, his flaming wrath against it lifts his mind to the highest flights of power, so that even his daring scepticism assumes a grandeur that dwarfs all easy acceptance of authoritative orthodoxy. With unerring skill Dr. McFadyen has brought all this home to us.

As the author tells us, this discussion of 'Job' is not primarily critical, yet behind the flow of lucid explanation the discerning eye will see acuteness of critical acumen operating upon a thorough knowledge of this most difficult text and its many variant readings. The scholarship here is scholarship at its best—profound but restrained. Probably this is best seen in the translation of 'Job' which is woven into the commentary. We are grateful to Dr. McFadyen for giving us a metrical version which combines trustworthy renderings with true poetic diction. There are here displayed a keen sense of dramatic values, a just appreciation of literary motifs, a careful and sympathetic exegesis, and a taste in translation impeccable alike on the sides of truth and of culture.

The whole commentary manifests a sincere and notable comprehension of the hero's problem, and on the psychical side of that problem Dr. McFadyen gives both enlightenment to the mind and hope to the heart. Thoroughly modern in tone, eminently sane but not pedestrian in interpretation, popular in a wholly becoming sense of that term, ***The Problem of Pain*** will, we are sure, find in this new edition a warm welcome from many readers both new and old.

ISAIAH.

Professor J. B. Allan, M.A., B.D., Ph.D., was undoubtedly right in his *Isaiah, chs.* 1–39, *Translated into Colloquial English* (National Adult School Union; 1s. net), when he determined to reproduce, so far as possible, something of the metrical lilt of the prophecy. This was not easy, but it was worth while, for the prophets were poets. He was also undoubtedly right in endeavouring 'to give an intelligible translation which is not a paraphrase.' A translator who aims at 'colloquial English' is almost irresistibly tempted to be paraphrastic; but a paraphrase, however valuable in its place, is not a translation. And Dr. Allan is to be congratulated not only on these high ideals of the translator's task, but on the success with which he has achieved them. The book abounds in passages of rhythmical and musical English. Here is one, which also illustrates the writer's close study of the text and his extensive knowledge of suggested emendations:

They've advanced through the heat of the south,
A land of stress and anxiety,
With lion and lioness roaring,
With vipers and snakes that have wings (30^{6}).

Of the longer passages, chs. 34 and 35 are a severe test of a translator's skill and sensitiveness to words, and Dr. Allan comes out of the ordeal excellently.

It is the more to be regretted, when the general level is so high, that Dr. Allan descends at times to English which is very decidedly and even painfully colloquial. For example, 'I'm fed up with burnt-offerings of rams' (1^{11}); 'When His fist is up, who can pull it down?' (14^{27}); 'chummy with thieves' (1^{23}); 'even the fir-trees are chuckling over you' (14^{8}); 'men who are fuddled with wine' (28^{1}); 'he that believes will not be let down' (28^{16}); 'does the axe cheek up to the chopper?' (10^{15}). Short of this slang, there are expressions which are too prosy: for example, 'trampling my courts is a thing you must stop . . . new moons and sabbaths I simply can't stand' ($1^{12f.}$). The difficulty of reproducing word-plays is notorious: the famous utterance in 7^{9}, which crystallizes Isaiah's gospel, appears thus, 'If you don't believe, you won't be alive.' Dr. Allan would probably defend the translations to which we have taken exception on the principle that 'alliteration, onomatopœia, acrostics and conundrums, startling and unexpected epigrams, refrains, witticisms, hyperboles, slang, and more, are everywhere.' Slang? But admittedly Isaiah's regal soul was matched by his regal style, and slang is the last thing one would look for in the poetry of one whose eyes had seen the King.

Nevertheless this is an excellent book. The chronological arrangement and the separation of the individual oracles will be of much value to the readers for whom the volume is intended, and the introductions, which are brief, are a really illuminating guide to the oracles which follow. Indeed, the book is so good, and so uniformly good, that it might have been better; and it may still be better if, in the second edition, which will soon be called for, the slang is replaced by language more consonant with the dignity of the prophet, who was a prince among stylists.

HANS DRIESCH.

Hans Driesch is, of course, a figure to be reckoned with, and it is well that his *Ethical Principles* (Allen & Unwin; 7s. 6d. net) has been translated. It is an extraordinarily lucid book (for which part of the credit, doubtless, rests with Mr. W. H. Johnston, the translator), dealing not much with abstract theory, but rather with the livest, not to say the liveliest, of subjects: Peace,—to the author *the* essential question of our day,—and War, and Pacificism, and Nationalism (a poor shabby business), and Patriotism good and bad, and the State, and Education, Marriage, Birth Control, and so on. Quite obviously we are here in a real world of palpable and solid things and very thorny problems. Yet Dr. Driesch never so much as hesitates, is calm, confident, self-assured, dogmatic upon every question as it rises. There is a phrase which at one portion of the book recurs almost with the insistence of a chorus—'this is a dualistic world.' Yet to this thinker life seems curiously simple at the core. A hearer of his once asserted that Dr. Denney's dogmatism in the pulpit had wakened more doubts in his mind than had anything else. 'For,' said he, 'he is so very certain that he forces me to think, "But there must be another side."' Few books for many a day have called out more hesitating question marks upon the margin from one reader than has this one. But it is a fine discipline to read this fruit of a convinced and vital mind. In any case our author warns us that at his age he feels he has some right to speak on ethics, since he has lived through those human situations which form its subject; and, even more, because he is convinced that, beyond questions of mere meaning, ethics is a confession and nothing more. He seems to fear that the world does not love confessions—a questionable verdict. Some, without a doubt, will turn aside to this one.

THE PATHETIC FALLACY.

The Pathetic Fallacy (Longmans; 5s. net), a booklet of less than one hundred and thirty pages, is a slight and superficial thing of no importance. But as a man with a virulent antipathy to something, who shouts his hate of it aloud at a street corner, is fairly certain of an audience of sorts, so Mr. Llewelyn Powys may gather quite a knot about him for a time. For he too is a good hater, and he has a loud and carrying voice. His particular antipathy is Christianity. Not that he knows much about it, or has begun to understand it. Indeed, the main impression left upon the reader is that not often can a less religious mind have had the hardihood to write about religion. Once on a day an English farmer expressed to the present writer a lofty contempt for literature. 'This 'ere Shakespeare now,' said he, 'of what use is he anyway? That muck now *is* of use, but——' and he waved the poet out of court.

But it is curious to see a bucolic mind of much the same type in essentials putting its curiously crude thoughts into print, and obviously spending time on it. For Mr. Powys is very nearly a distinguished writer. There are pages that reveal real sensitiveness in his finger-tips for the right word; though, unfortunately, there are others that fall curiously far below his own high standard. None the less he can write. But the thinking just won't do. For some natures the sinister office of *advocatus diaboli* must have been a sheer joy. Mr. Powys is of the number. He takes this thing, Christianity, with its astonishing record of gallantry and self-sacrifice, this thing which beyond question has been the inspiration and the power of lives innumerable, and, passing all that by, he gloats over the shadows in the story and fastens thirstily on any sore. The whole chapter on the beyond, for example, consists of three lurid quotations—the over-worked passage from poor old Tertullian, that of course; and one from Aquinas, and one from Father Furness. And that is all. And this is headed Christian conceptions. To him this whole business for which Christianity stands is just a dream, and we have wakened, and it must go, is going, indeed has almost gone, says he, adding 'Thank God,' if indeed there is a God to thank. One has heard that many times before, and often put with vastly greater point and power than here, and still the faith survives. 'If,' said old John Newton, 'you think you see the ark of God toppling, you can be absolutely certain that that is due to a swimming in your own head.'

The publishers, boosting their wares, put on the cover, 'It is a simple matter to *say* that the basis of Christianity is so unreasonable that it could not be accepted by any intelligent person of modern ideas, but it is another thing altogether to set down arguments which that modern intelligent person will find convincing.'—'For this opinion he here sets down his reasons. Are they convincing?'

It is difficult to believe that any human being can ask that question with sincerity, so trivial is the argument. But what jars one is the so-called tribute to Jesus Christ. 'No homage could be great enough with which to honour Him.' One wonders, on the author's showing of things, why. Certainly it is when speaking of Christ that he writes his best, and is himself most stirred. Much in Christ thrills him. 'There was that in Him that could not be contaminated.' 'A mean soul He could smell from afar off like a bad fish.' 'No man has been less blinkered than Jesus, less spiritually blindfold.' And yet 'the intellect can get no coherent sense out of these pages.' 'He said many ignorant and foolish things.' 'The mind of Jesus was full of misconceptions: life is not ordered by a loving father. A sucking child can see that it is not.' Multitudes have found it necessary to give Christ a homage far greater than that, and even dare to question if Mr. Llewelyn Powys is big enough to talk down to Him in this complacent fashion. As for Paul—on 1 Co 13 there is this: 'It was as though a toad sitting under a burdock leaf had suddenly opened its wide gaping mouth, and lo, because there was love in its heart, had been able to give utterance to a music more beautiful than the singing of any hermit thrush.' And Calvin: 'One crazy thought follows another in dreary sequence.' And so on. Mr. Powys thinks that all philosophies and all religions and all moralities have sprung from fear of death. 'As toadstools grow up from buried logs, so do these fantasies take their nourishment from buried bones.' We spin vain dreams to keep ourselves brave. But they are only dreams. Science I know, and Freud I know, he says. But, turning to Christianity, what is this? It is something big enough to look down with a kindly humour on this little man who hopes to scream it out of the hearts innumerable in which it has proved itself.

THE EVOLUTIONARY PROCESS.

Spirit in Evolution, by Mr. Herbert F. Standing, D.Sc. (Allen & Unwin; 10s. 6d. net), sufficiently declares its purpose by its title. The writer defines the central thesis of his book as being 'that the whole evolutionary process is fundamentally a manifestation of divine purpose and activity, and that man's spiritual experiences, involving the realization of his highest ideals of Beauty, Truth, Goodness, and Love, are in line with the upward trend of Organic Evolution, and alone give an intelligible meaning to the whole World-process.' In elucidating and defending this thesis he undertakes a rapid but comprehensive survey of the main factors which have dominated the evolutionary process. These are arranged under six principal heads, namely, Response to Environment, Nutrition, Unification, Race Preservation, Sublimation of Mental Processes, and Evolution of Values. In his treatment the writer makes liberal use of illustrative examples drawn from the writings of leading biologists, but he maintains his independence of mind throughout by the skilful use he makes of them in supporting his main thesis. His argument generally is in favour of an emergent evolution with God acknowledged as 'the Fundamental Directive Activity.' 'From the purely scientific point of view we may think of the various "emergent" qualities which successively make their appearance as the "outspringing of something which has hitherto not been in being." This does not prevent our holding the philosophic position that this same evolutionary advance is a progressive manifestation of the Creative Activity of God. . . . This immanent activity which is the ultimate source of the phenomena which we seek to explain in the process of evolution culminates for the religious consciousness in the intuitive enjoyment of the Divine Activity within us. Not only is it true that in Him we live and move and have our being, but the human consciousness also testifies to the influx of divine energy which dominates, transforms, and utilises the human personality, bringing it into line with those moral and spiritual forces in harmony with which the highest evolutionary process is alone possible.' The book is not too technical for the general reader, to whom it is fitted to give a very sane and well-reasoned view of the evolutionary process as leading upward towards ideal human personality.

THE LITERATURE OF THE NEW TESTAMENT.

Some years ago Dr. Alexander Nairne, Regius Professor of Divinity at Cambridge, wrote a book entitled 'Every Man's Story of the Old Testament' which has commanded a very large sale. A companion volume, *Every Man's Story of the New Testament* (Mowbray; quarter-canvas 4s. 6d. net, cloth 6s. net), has now appeared, also likely to be widely read, though its appeal is not so much, like that of the former book, to Every Man in general as to Every Man who takes a serious and thoughtful interest in the Bible. The volume is furnished with several maps and embellished with a great number of illustrations. The style is nervous and vivid, and the pages are enriched with many an instance drawn from literature and history. Altogether an admirable *vade mecum* for the general student of the New Testament.

What is it that we find in this book? Not an outline of the modern criticism of the New Testament, though the author is never unmindful of critical positions. Rather is it an endeavour to follow the story of the New Testament as a movement, and to trace the growth of its inner significance. 'The course of the Gospel is like a river. The source is fed by manifold influences, from far and near, hidden or visible. From the source the stream springs among the hills. There it runs purely and delightfully. Thence through a chasm it falls in cataract; and sweeps on as a river, enlarged and deepened by tributaries, fertilising wide lands. Then dissipated, retarded, strained to rarer purity in the sands, it debouches at last into the sea.' The gospel stream and spring in Galilee, the cataract of Calvary, the swelling of the Galilean stream into a river fertilizing Syria and Europe, then a period of retardation, and then the issuing of the gospel upon its world-wide, pervasive destiny—all this is depicted in these pages, in both its outward and its inward aspect, with masterly skill, with originality and freshness, and from a standpoint at once modern and evangelical. The perusal of such a book could not fail to illuminate for Every Man the whole literature of the New Testament, and might well lead him to consult some of the further 'aids to study' mentioned by Dr. Nairne in his discriminating and liberal-minded penultimate chapter.

METHODISM AND INDUSTRIAL REVOLUTION.

In *The Wesleyan Movement in the Industrial Revolution* (Longmans; 15s. net) Mr. Wellman J. Warner, Ph.D., has written a very able and well-documented work, based on a thorough study of the contemporary authorities. The plan of the book is simple. Against the background of a discussion of the emergence of the individual in the eighteenth century, Dr. Warner explores the Methodist contribution to the political liberalism, the economic life, and the philanthropic enterprise of the period. He finds the basis of Wesleyan social ethics in the doctrines of the diseased will and perfectionism, and treats these doctrines with an insight not always manifest in students of social progress. Dr. Warner argues that in its political trends the Methodist social theory embodied conflicting tendencies, since its main thesis, that the full play of the moralized will can solve all social problems, was 'curiously yoked with an idea of providence' which, after Wesley's death, was used to justify the existing status, and fostered a definitely conservative spirit. In the sphere of economic ideals the Methodists displayed a healthy enthusiasm: industriousness was exalted as a duty, a high standard of economic morality was required, and the man of property was taught that he was but a steward of God, 'the sole proprietor of all things.' In the third stage of his investigation Dr. Warner fully illustrates the Methodist record of philanthropy, but finds the failure of the movement in 'its inability to translate this habitual mood into anything more than personal and ameliorative activity.'

In sum, Dr. Warner's evaluation of Methodism in the industrial revolution is that of a noble and effective movement which 'missed its opportunity.' The measure of truth in this indictment cannot be denied, but, on the other hand, Dr. Warner does no sort of justice to the immense service of Methodism in counteracting destructive social forces, a feature which has deeply impressed M. Halévy and other students of the period, and he makes no reference to the passion for social righteousness characteristic of the Primitive Methodists. These omissions only stimulate our desire that Dr. Warner may pursue his investigations further into the social aspects of the Methodist movement, for over the ground covered he has shown himself a highly competent and well-informed guide.

The one hundred and sixteenth volume of *The Christian World Pulpit* has now been issued (Christian World; 7s. 6d. net). It contains the weekly parts which appeared between July and December 1929. The bulk of the volume contains sermons which have been reported almost verbatim, but in addition to this there are some outlines given. The work of the best preachers is represented, and it is obvious from this collection that there is no falling off in the standard of preaching in this country. One of the sermons given in 'The Christian Year' last month appeared in this volume.

In *The Priest in the Church* (James Clarke; 5s.

net), the Rev. J. Edward Flower, M.A., narrates the progress of those doctrines and practices in the Anglican Church which constitute a breach with Protestantism, and in his view fully justified the rejection of the Revised Prayer Book by Parliament. The author is very frank and quite uncompromising in his robust Protestantism. We regret the subtitle of the book—'an unexplored page in English ecclesiastical history.' The book breaks no new ground.

In *The Slavonic Josephus and its Relation to Josippon and Hegesippus* (Dropsie College, Philadelphia), Professor Solomon Zeitlin returns to the question of the Christ Passage in Josephus, with which he had dealt in an earlier brochure, and answers the criticism of Dr. Eisler, who had accused him of ignoring a Christian passage found in Josippon. Zeitlin argues that in the original Josippon, which he assigns to the fifth century, there was no story about Jesus. The Latin Hegesippus, which is a free translation from the Greek Josephus compiled during the fourth century, is full of Christian interpolations. Zeitlin's conclusion is that not only were there no Christian passages in Josippon, but that there was none in Josephus; that 'the passage which we now find in the "Antiquities" was not from the hand of Josephus, but was interpolated by Eusebius.' He seems to demolish effectually Eisler's hypothesis that the Slavonic Josephus is based on a book by Josephus on the capture of Jerusalem which gave an account of Jesus and His Apostles. 'There never was such a book.' Zeitlin argues that the Slavonic Josephus is in reality a translation from a *Byzantine* Greek version of the accepted Josephus, by a writer acquainted with the Apocryphal Gospels and the Church Fathers.

The Rev. Roderick Dunkerley has reprinted his article on *The Oxyrhynchus Gospel Fragments* that appeared in the 'Harvard Theological Review' in January of this year. Copies (1s. post free) may be had from him; his address is 10 Brunswick Square, Gloucester, England. The Fragments he deals with are Oxyrhynchus Papyri 1, 654, 655, 840, and 1224. The first two of these, the so-called 'Sayings of Jesus' and 'New Sayings of Jesus,' gave rise to considerable discussion. The two most recent theories as to their origin are those of Evelyn White, who traces them to the (Aramaic) Gospel according to the Hebrews, and Vernon Bartlet, who traces them to the Alexandrine Gospel of the Twelve or Greek Gospel according to the Hebrews. The author of the article hesitates over both theories; indeed, he is of opinion that the two Fragments may not be from the same work. The first is probably part of a genuine Treasury of Sayings gathered from the Canonical Gospels and elsewhere, and the second part of a secondary Gospel.

The Rev. Vincent Taylor, Ph.D., D.D., already well known for his contributions in the field of New Testament criticism, has followed these up with an Introduction to the four Gospels, a remarkably clear and compendious exposition on which he is to be congratulated. The work is entitled *The Gospels: A Short Introduction* (Epworth Press; 2s. 6d. net), and treats questions of sources, date, and authorship, and the mutual relations of one Gospel to another. It is a book which should be welcomed by the beginner in such studies, and the more advanced student would find it very convenient for reference. The expositions and discussions are couched in a restrained and judicious style, and bear the hall-mark of competence. That the work is fresh and up to date may be gathered from the fact that it offers guidance to the reader on such matters as the 'form-historical method,' the proto-Luke hypothesis, and the Mandæan parallels in the Fourth Gospel. It is a timely remark that 'form-criticism is a significant protest against the tyranny of source-criticism.'

The Free Spirit, by Mr. Carl Heath (Friends' Book Centre; 3s.), is a plea for the application to religion of the experimental method which is universally employed to-day by investigators into every other aspect of reality. Any creed worth having must issue from experience. Mr. Heath also argues earnestly against the Dualism which would set the God of Nature as a non-moral Being against the moral Being who is our Heavenly Father. There cannot be two centres of being, each in radical conflict with the other; besides, man is included within Nature. From this point of view he criticises Barth. While fully appreciating the tremendous power and influence of that teacher's message, he finds in the radical separation between the natural and the spiritual the destruction of any really integral conception of life. One of the best chapters is on the Mystery of Grace, in which he joins issue with the common view that grace is the merely arbitrary favour of an awful God, and argues that 'this grace is poured out on all men; beauty and truth and goodness are alike for the just and the unjust, the saint and the sinner, the Christian and the non-Christian alike.' The writer also takes occasion to prove that the Quaker is as appreciative of the community idea as of the inner light. Athanasias appears twice on p. 36. Altogether a little book full of generous and stimulating thought.

This year's *Journal of the Manchester Egyptian and Oriental Society*, No. xv. (Manchester University Press), contains, among other interesting items, a chapter on Recent Excavations (Egyptian) by Miss W. M. Crompton, the secretary, and one on 'The Life-giving Pearl,' by Professor Maurice A. Canney, as well as an excellent appreciation of Professor A. S. Peake and other vice-presidents who have passed away. The Society, which has over seventy members, deals with questions regarding the languages, literatures, and history of Egypt and the Orient, and also helps excavating societies in their work. The Journal is worthy of study by all who look for accurate historical thinking about the East.

Dr. Harold Paul Sloan, of the Haddonfield Methodist Episcopal Church, New Jersey, has written a new work entitled *The Apostles' Creed* (Methodist Book Concern, New York; $1.50). In the Introduction it is justly claimed for the writer that 'about the successive tenets he has built a continuous discourse of exposition and instruction.' For he goes through the various clauses of the Creed in turn, expounds them sympathetically from a conservative standpoint, and applies their teaching in the evangelical spirit and with evangelical fervour to the lives of his hearers (who appear to have been the young people of his congregation). His book embodies a good deal of his personal experience, and is full of illustrative instances and references. The style is graphic, and at times unduly rhetorical; enthusiastic, and at times betrays a facile optimism. We have no doubt that these addresses have served to build up Dr. Sloan's congregation in the Christian faith, and we regard them as worthy of publication.

In a pamphlet, *What is the Meaning of the Parable of the Dishonest Steward?*, the Rev. W. R. G. Moir (Ardmore, Kinnear Road, Edinburgh; 4d.) offers, humbly and yet with confidence, an interpretation all his own of the much-disputed passage, Lk 16^{1-13}. He contends, in full view of the original text and of the commentaries, that the message of the Parable is to the Twelve, the other disciples, and the Pharisees and scribes; and its burden is that on our use of God's riches to save sinners our own salvation depends.

Pro Fide (Murray; 12s. net), by the Rev. Charles Harris, D.D., Prebendary of Hereford Cathedral, has proved a useful manual of Apologetics. First published in 1905, it is now in its fourth edition. The third edition contained a supplementary chapter in defence of the Chalcedonian orthodoxy; the fourth edition also contains a supplementary chapter, which we notice in another column, in which guidance is offered to the Christian apologist on recent tendencies of thought. The theological standpoint of the author, negatively described, is anti-modernist; positively described, it is liberal-orthodox. The range of the work is very comprehensive. The book begins with an exposition and defence of theism, and then passes to such general theological or philosophical doctrines as those of creation, freedom, and immortality, finally considering more specific points of Christian apology such as the person of Jesus and His miracles and resurrection. The bibliographies are up to date.

To the 'Every Teacher's Library' Series, the Rev. R. C. Gillie, M.A., D.C.L., has contributed a useful volume on *The Later Story of the Hebrews*, practically the three centuries that separate Amos from Malachi (National Sunday School Union; 2s. 6d. net). The story, which is told in refreshingly simple language and in a thoroughly interesting way, wisely weaves material from the prophetical books into the historical narrative, with the result that the reader, besides winning a clear impression of the sequence of events, is also confronted at every turn with the great figures and messages of the prophets. This is all to the good. A valuable feature of the narrative is that it is enlivened by analogies drawn from modern history. Cyrus' toleration for foreign religions, for example, recalls 'the custom of our kings, who are Anglicans when in England and Presbyterians when in Scotland.' Again, the difficulties of the Jewish settlers on their return from Babylon are compared by Dr. Gillie to the difficulties that attended the settlement of New England in the early part of the seventeenth century. The present uncertainties that beset Old Testament criticism are illustrated by the statement that no result is more certain than that Is 40–55 was 'sent forth when Cyrus' prospective triumph was imminent,' but Professor Torrey has recently argued elaborately against this view. Privelege (p. 116) should be corrected, and on p. 46 Is xxviii. should be xxvii. The book, which vividly describes a significant period of history, may be heartily commended to teachers and pupils alike.

The Rev. Basil Mathews has added a third (and last) volume to his two former on *Jesus and Youth: A World-Study of Jesus Christ* (Pilgrim Press; 2s. 6d. net). This volume contains lesson-outlines for young adolescents, with subjects for discussion and daily Bible readings. It takes us to the end of the ministry of Jesus in the gospel narrative. Every one of the 'studies' is done on the same lines. The story is told, with lively and suitable explanations and interpolations, so that the telling raises many vital questions as it goes along. Then the definite subjects for discussion are mentioned, and finally a series of Bible readings for the week, leading up to the lesson. It is all very well done, and we cordially commend the three volumes to those who have classes of young adolescents to teach. They could not get better guidance or a better guide.

The Scientific Background of the Christian Creeds (Andrew Reid & Co., Newcastle; 2s. net) is a booklet composed of two Riddell Memorial Lectures recently delivered before the University of Durham by Professor W. M. Thornton, O.B.E., D.Sc., D.Eng., of the Chair of Electrical Engineering. The first lecture is entitled 'The Doctrine of the Trinity and the Kenosis Theory'; the second, 'The Consequent Clauses of the Creeds.' The lectures are remarkable as apparently combining loyalty to the Catholic Creeds with a fresh scientific outlook upon the universe. Though the lecturer is convinced that to approach religion through science alone is impossible, he finds in recent scientific theory a true point of contact with religious belief. It appears to him that 'science by its discovery that the universe is finite, and that matter and energy are interchangeable, has placed in our hands a key to one of the mysteries of creation, the manner in which it was done and the vast extent of the effort.' Nor is he content to establish scientific contact with the general religious doctrine of creation. As the following quotation shows, he seeks to press scientific principles into the very heart of Christian doctrine itself: 'the visible material universe is the Kenosis of God the Father in the same sense that we may regard the Incarnation and self-surrender of Christ as the Kenosis of the Son.'

It is some time since we drew attention to the very cheap sermon series which is being published by Messrs. Stockwell under the title of 'The People's Pulpit.' The latest—and this is an excellent volume—is *Comprehensive Religion*, by the Hon. and Rev. James Adderley (2s. 6d. net). It was from this volume that we gave some extracts in 'The Christian Year' last month. Mr. Adderley explains why he has called the volume *Comprehensive Religion*. It is because in it he has tried to keep in mind points upon which all Christians do, or ought to, agree. 'I am convinced that it is only as a Comprehensive Church that we Anglicans can justify our position in Christendom. I do not apologise for the title. Rather, I believe that God has called us to make what may seem a new experiment in religion. At any rate, if Comprehensiveness is right, it is the Church of England that has the best opportunity of realising it.'

Other volumes in this series are:—*The Unending Benediction*, by the Rev. J. Emrys Morgan, B.D.; *The Seven Words from the Cross*, by the Rev. E. P. Dickie, B.D.; *Is there a Future for Calvinism?* by the Rev. H. Tydeman Chilvers; *Paul and the Prodigal Son*, by the Rev. J. E. Rattenbury, D.D.; *Life's Unknown Demands*, by the Rev. Campbell Taylor, M.A.; *The Discovery of God*, by the Rev. Joseph Johnston, M.A.; *Human Relationships*, by the Rev. Godwin Birchenough, M.A.; '*Thorough*,' by the Rev. H. Bowden-Smith, M.A.; *Members of the Kingdom*, by the Rev. J. W. Augur, M.A.; *Nazareth Politics*, by the Rev. P. T. R. Kirk, M.A.; *The Centre of the Road*, by the Rev. W. Cocks, A.K.C.; *Within the Veil*, by the Rev. Oswald Harvey, M.A.; *Life in Christ*, by the Rev. B. Scott Williams, B.D.; *Jesus and the Art of Living*, by the Rev. A. Herbert Gray, D.D.

The Bishop of Gloucester, Dr. A. C. Headlam, will always be listened to with respect, because he is a scholar of recognized eminence, because he is sincere, and because he is moderate and broad-minded, while perfectly loyal to his own convictions. These are great qualities, and they are all evident in a book which he has just published, *Christian Unity* (S.C.M.; 4s. net). Every Anglican writer at present seems to be discussing the same topic. Books on it rain from the press week by week. But few of them are more rewarding than this one. It contains the substance of four lectures delivered at Oxford and at King's College, London. The topics are The Need of Unity, The Unity of the Faith, The Church, The Sacrament, The Ministry, and The South Indian Scheme. Dr. Headlam shirks none of the difficulties, but he finds none of them too great to be surmounted by charity and knowledge. The book will be anathema to extremists, for Dr. Headlam frankly confesses that there is no ground in Scripture that can be pleaded either by Episcopalians or Presbyterians as Divine warrant for their systems. He finds no insuperable barrier to reunion in the doctrine either of the ministry or the Sacraments, and he gives his blessing to the South India Scheme. Whatever school the reader belongs to, he ought to read this book. Its spirit, if nothing else, will do him good. It is an eirenicon in the best Christian sense.

The great 'human needs,' says Bishop Francis John McConnell, are Better Health, More Wealth, Sounder Knowledge, Larger Freedom, Closer Fellowship, and the Vision of God. He says this at great length and with ample illustration in his book *Human Needs and World Christianity* (S.C.M.; 5s. net). As the title suggests, Dr. McConnell thinks that Christianity should help in meeting these needs. But it is *world* Christianity, not ours or yours, and especially not western Christianity *alone*. He has much to say of the superiority complex with which we approach non-Christian peoples, and he finds much to blame in this. 'We need for the total vision of God the contribution of all peoples,' he writes. We are to co-operate with non-Christian people. The uniqueness of Christianity is its unique power to use everything that is usable. This is one of the points in Dr. McConnell's able book. The other is that evangelization of the world does not only mean carrying the 'gospel,' but meeting the great human needs. The book is well written, and never dull. It is full of a noble passion for a real, world-wide, and penetrating influence of the gospel of Jesus Christ.

Anything done to promote systematic and intelligent Bible reading must be highly serviceable to the Church and the individual Christian life. *Jesus among Men*, by H. T. Hodgkin, M.A., M.B. (S.C.M.; 4s. net), aims at rendering this service. It contains a series of readings from the Gospels covering a period of twelve weeks. The readings of each week are devoted to one topic, such as Jesus and the Common Man, Jesus and the Home, Jesus and Women, etc. Each day's reading is elucidated by a brief and pointed commentary, while each week's topic is summed up in a review. The whole work is done with insight and care, and the writer's hope is 'that the book may prove valuable in promoting and revitalising the practice of family worship.'

Interest in the Eastern Church is deepening in the West, and sources of accurate information are accumulating. We cordially recommend a small book which we have read with great pleasure—*The Church of the Greek People Past and Present*, by Miss Euphrosyne Kephala (Williams & Norgate; 5s. net). It gives an interesting, informative, and succinct account of the history of the Church in Greece since Greek independence was achieved, its constitution, sacraments, doctrines, ritual, clergy, and spirit. Its accuracy is guaranteed by a Foreword by the Archbishop of Thyatira.

Theology in Relation to Preaching.

By the Reverend H. J. Lewis, Tunstall, Stoke-on-Trent.

Is preaching to-day less theological than formerly? This question no doubt often presents itself to the church-goer, if in his reading he strolls through the fields, or ought we to say over the highlands, of sermonic literature produced by generations now gone. We are fond of making comparisons, and no doubt preachers of to-day congratulate themselves that they are not expected to discourse for long periods on such subjects as 'Predestination,' 'Eternal Punishment,' or 'Christ's Body not in the Eucharist'—a theme which John Wycliffe chose upon one occasion. These subjects are taboo to the average congregation, and often to the preacher himself. We hear enough about 'dry' sermons, though it should be remembered that the criticism that a sermon is 'dry' depends for its validity as much upon the mentality of the listener as upon the subject-matter of the discourse. We have discovered that the sermon which would have delighted an audience when preached by John Wesley would be much less attractive to the average congregation to-day. This does not mean that the subjects chosen by the founder of Methodism had in themselves no permanent value, it merely indicates that the thought of the age is along other lines and chooses to express itself in other ways. The extent to which the 'pew' governs the utterance of the 'pulpit' would form the theme of a very interesting discussion. We are not concerned with that just now; we simply note the fact that the old type of theological discourse seems to have passed.

It must be admitted that the language of the pulpit has changed. One-time familiar words such as 'Atonement,' 'Justification,' 'Sanctification,' 'Regeneration,' are gradually slipping from the vocabulary of religious speech. This is reflected also in the hymns chosen for congregational worship. We would not imply that the great doctrines of our Christian faith are treated as of less importance than formerly. We simply call attention to a general tendency, to which, no doubt, there are numerous exceptions, yet which must be very noticeable to older people of the present day.

Again, with regard to the training of the preacher, both ministerial and lay, changes in relation to the study of theology are observed. The old compendium of theology has largely fallen into disuse. Handbooks such as that of Dr. J. S. Banks, or the larger work of Dr. W. B. Pope, now rest in dusty retirement upon the shelves. Sometimes the demand is made for a text-book of theology which will cover the whole ground of Christian doctrine, though such a demand, if met, could only partially suffice. Theological books are written by the score, but they differ in style and treatment from those of the past very considerably. The *Outline of Christian Theology*, by Dr. W. Newton Clarke, is now many years old. Others have been written since, but this book marked a new era in theological statement. It was written in the light of much new learning, and took account of matters which Dr. Banks and Dr. Pope did not consider. It marked an expansion of theological views, and yet Dr. W. Newton Clarke modestly calls his work of nearly five hundred pages an 'Outline.' In the light of subsequent events it is no doubt too much to expect any one to produce a text-book which would give a complete statement of theological belief. If the world has grown smaller by virtue of easy facilities for communication, the thought of man has widened as the result of research and discovery. This widening of thought has proved to be a matter of vital importance to religion, and hence to theology. Theology is no longer limited to the textual substance of the Old and New Testaments. It is now a science of many branches. The tree has grown and is still growing. Little surprise need be felt that the plan of studies of local preachers, college students, and probationary ministers provides for theological study by means of specialization in particular subjects, rather than by the study of a handbook, however well written, which attempts to cover the whole ground of religious thought.

According to its etymological meaning, the word 'theology' denotes discourse or doctrine concerning God. In this sense it was used among the Greeks to describe the work of poets like Homer and Hesiod when they wrote of the gods and their doings. It was also applied to the speculative philosophy of Plato and Aristotle when they argued concerning the supreme reality or ultimate ground of all things. In early Christian literature the word 'theologian' was applied to orthodox Greek Fathers, like Athanasius and others who distinguished themselves in defending the Personality and Divinity of the λόγος. Theology in earliest times was limited to doctrine concerning God—His being and attributes. But to-day it has a much wider meaning. Man's knowledge of God is part of the content of that in experience which we call religion. Now religion takes account of the world of Nature and of man; of sin and of death; of salvation and of immortal life. Hence in these days we find the phrase 'science of religion' substituted for the older word 'theology.' The suggestion is made that what was once the most important branch of human knowledge is now only one department of scientific investigation. Scientific method is pressed into the service of religious inquiry with the idea of eliminating uncertainty and establishing religious truth upon a foundation that cannot be shaken.

In the day when the distinctively 'theological' sermon was preached, theology was the chief of sciences. Some of our modern and very important sciences were unknown in the developed form in which we know them. Much of the material with which they deal was available, but men did not think it worth while to specialize to the same extent as we do to-day; which no doubt partially accounts for the different type of sermon of the present time. We find, therefore, that while theology is looked upon as one amongst other branches of scientific investigation, and in a measure has lost the prominent position it once held, in itself it is a much bigger thing than in the past. The widening of the sphere of knowledge generally has greatly extended the scope of theological study, with the result that things which once were unassociated with it, are now included. Theology having adopted the scientific method characteristic of other branches of knowledge, has been brought to a truer sense of its own value in relation to life as a whole.

The result is, that theology is less dogmatic than was once the case. This does not mean that the truths with which it deals are less real or less important. It means rather, that, before expressing ourselves with an air of infallibility, we keep an open mind until all the factors which might have a bearing upon our subject have been investigated. Perhaps we shall never see a return to the dogmatism of former generations, because knowledge from unanticipated sources comes upon us like a flood so that we are reluctant to express ourselves. Indeed, where former generations were certain beyond the point of contradiction, we hesitate. To some minds this lack of certainty is a distinct weakness and the pulpit is blamed for its indefiniteness. Along some lines the complaint seems to be justified, but in reality it should be interpreted as a compliment. We are bound at times to be less definite than formerly, but that is because we recognize that religious knowledge is not a closed system. The last fifty years have revolutionized discovery, not only in non-theological matters but especially in relation to the chief sources from which theological material is obtained. The Bible is a different book to us from what it was to Archbishop Cranmer, or even John Wesley, and it is because many do not recognize the sweeping changes that have taken place along that line alone that they marvel at the lack of dogmatic utterance from the pulpit to-day.

The conception which some have of the task of theology, is that it should set forth in a coherent, systematic form the content of that revelation concerning God, the world, and man of which the Bible is the inspired record. But while this is undoubtedly a very important department of theology, such a conception limits too much its scope and function. There are other materials and data for theological construction besides those furnished by the Bible which cannot be ignored by the scientific theologian. The natural world, together with our knowledge of the course of history, afford data of experience which are invaluable in building up a coherent system of theological belief. To this should be added the study of the moral consciousness of mankind generally. This general revelation in Nature, history, and conscience may be, however, and often is, treated as part of a scheme the chief factor in which is the historic revelation given through the religious experience of Israel and culminating in Jesus Christ.

Admitting, then, the extensiveness of the field covered by theological inquiry, we proceed to outline its dimensions. Thinking of theology as the 'science of religion,' we shall observe at once how vast a thing it is. We may divide it roughly into two main sections, each of which is capable of subdivision. Theology is related to the past and the present so that it has an historical content as well as a constructive. Historical theology must be held to cover non-Christian as well as Christian religious experience; for if theology is thought of as the 'science of religion,' we cannot limit our study to one form of religious expression more than another. Here we find ourselves taking up a position which the theology of the past very largely avoided. We no longer look upon non-Christian religions as wholly pernicious and devoid of any real value. Indeed, we recognize them to be the outcome of the soul's upward struggle under a variety of conditions of culture and environment, and, that being so, they have a real value for our purpose. We are just as justified in bringing these in review as we are the Hebrew faith. As an example of the adoption of this method we would call attention to Professor A. C. Underwood's volume, *Conversion, Christian and Non-Christian.* The study of non-Christian religions along the line of their origin, development, and relation to each other, to say nothing of their psychological value, cannot be rightly excluded from the sphere of scientific religious study. Such study will be largely historical.

With regard to the Christian religion in particular, we shall find that this historical aspect of theological study is very important, and may be summed up under the general term 'Biblical science.' The place of the Bible in the Christian religion needs no emphasis here. Already it has been pointed out that our ideas regarding its value and nature have undergone a great change in the last half-century, a change which is responsible very largely for the difference in form and content of modern preaching compared with a century ago. Biblical science forms no small part to-day of theological study, and has been chiefly responsible for a type of preaching which has appeared to be destructive rather than constructive. The criticism that Biblical science seeks to break down rather than to build up is superficial. It is only destructive in so far as it seeks to remove misconceptions and wrong interpretations. Its real purpose is definitely constructive. It is not unlikely that we have now reached a point where our knowledge of the Bible has taken a form more or less permanent, only subject to minor modifications in the future. But whatever the future may hold, the Bible is now a far more effective instrument for righteousness than ever before, and is certainly capable of demonstrating the working out of God's purposes in human life in a way that is in harmony with our knowledge of His operations in other spheres.

What is called 'Biblical science' in its historical content includes many things. It deals amongst other things with the study of the original languages of the Bible and the interpretation and exposition of the actual text of Scripture. Allied to this is the investigation of the Biblical documents in relation to their date, authorship, and historical setting. Inquiry into the evolution of the ideas of God, man, society, and immortality in Hebrew literature is a very important branch of theology. The origin of the Christian Church, its early constitution and thought, forms part of this science, to say nothing of the history of doctrine and the use of symbols, creeds, and confessions. So that if we were simply to limit our conception of theology to its historical content we should find it by no means a simple thing. No one who would be a faithful preacher can ignore these things. We may not become experts in all of them, but we must take account of them, for they have a rightful place in our theological scheme.

But there is that other great division—the constructive. The use of this term by no means implies that the historical study to which we have referred is specially destructive. It is so called because it includes those sciences which deal with religion as a present-day reality and power, claiming to be truth by which the practical life of man should be moulded and regulated. Like the historical, this constructive inquiry may be pursued along two lines—general and special—the former dealing with the presentation, defence, and application of the truths of religion in general, and the latter with Christianity in particular as the highest and ultimate form of religion. Under the general study of practical religion comes the question of the inherent nature of religious experience and belief, and its truth as against Atheism, Materialism, Agnosticism, and other forms of unbelief. Likewise, the rational proofs for the existence of God and the various ways in which the human mind rises to the apprehension of supreme personal spirit as the ultimate reality, come within the scope of general constructive study. These are all theological studies, and of no mean importance.

Perhaps it is the special branch of constructive theology with which we are most familiar, for it seems to provide that practical material which we feel to be of the greatest service to us as preachers. We are distinctly preachers of Christianity, and undoubtedly we are convinced that such is the highest form of religion and the surest way of salvation for the soul. We shall seek to preach Christ and Him crucified, but, well-intentioned as we may be, we shall find that we cannot isolate Christ from life either historical or present, and the lines of theological thought which have already been outlined all have a bearing upon our presentation of His gospel.

In this presentation of Christianity we shall find ourselves called upon to consider the question as to how the Christian revelation has come to the world, and involved therein are such matters as Divine inspiration, the trustworthiness of the Bible as a record of fact and experience, together with the evidences of the truth of the gospel as proclaimed by Christ and its fitness to meet human need. The development of doctrine within the Church, revealed in the various creeds and doctrinal statements, should likewise be noticed. Doctrines of the Church, the Priesthood, the Sacraments, and the Future Life form no small part of the content of what is distinctively Christian theology. Christian morality in its individual and social relationships as set forth in the family, Church, State, or nation demands attention. The life of the Church as an organization, its methods of government, its forms of worship, its missionary method, all form part of the subject-matter of theology.

This brief summary of the content of theology shows something of the magnitude of the field of study, and it may appear, at first, that things have been included which are somewhat remote from what has generally been associated with it. But an examination of any one of these lines of inquiry will show that it has a real bearing upon religion, and therefore can claim to be included in the science of religion. We speak the truth if we say that almost every sermon touches upon one or other of these themes. If it is true that in the old sense of the term preaching was theological, it is no less true now. We may not openly refer to our theology in technical terms, but consideration of the vast ground covered by theological study will reveal that, unless we are theological students in the best and widest sense of the term, our preaching will be less effective than it should be for the advancement of the Kingdom of God. There are some things mentioned in this survey which it would be folly to use as subjects for sermons. We have to present our matter in non-technical terms, we have to guard against using language which is remote from common life, above all things we have to avoid unreality. But we have, at the same time, to present the truth, and if we refuse to recognize the legitimate claim of any of the lines of study here noted we run grave risk of distorting that truth. Theology and preaching are big things, making big demands and giving big rewards. In proportion as we are big in relation to the one, so shall we be in the other.

In the Study.

Virginibus Puerisque.

A Deflected Aim.

By the Reverend A. Beaghan, East Molesey, Surrey.

'Aim at what is above, where Christ is.'—Col 3^1 (Moffatt's Trans.).

I had an interesting talk the other day with a man who works in a torpedo factory, where they make those mysterious playthings for the Navy. He told me lots of wonderful things about torpedoes that I haven't time to tell you, except that they have to measure to the thousandth part of an inch when they make these baby battleships, for that is what they really are. Of course he couldn't tell me the secrets of the torpedo, but I asked him whether they could guide a torpedo with wireless yet. 'Yes, they can,' he said, 'and they can guide an aerial torpedo fired from an aeroplane in flight; at any rate, they have actually done it, though they haven't got the thing perfect yet.' He told me that they were able to guide a ship by wireless twenty years ago. I expect he thought I was very simple not to know that, but I didn't, and I expect if I made a guess I should find that you didn't know either.

But I learned something else about guiding ships by wireless, and I want to tell you about that really, and not about torpedoes. It sounds quite uncanny to think of a ship—a sort of mystery ship—out on the horizon, without a soul on board, sailing to some mysterious port, with a mysterious cargo, all under the control of a man who sits up in a tower, or at a desk, guiding the ship to its journey's end—the sort of thing you might easily see at the pictures; or like a Jules Verne story that scarcely anybody reads now, because, I suppose, so many of the things he yarned about have actually come to life. I found myself wondering why, if they knew how to control ships by wireless twenty years ago, they don't do it now. Well, I'll tell you. They made another discovery when they tested this wonderful process. They were making a great demonstration before the big people of the naval world, and the model ship was being turned just wherever the controller wanted it to go in the harbour where they were testing it. When they had finished, and everybody was bursting with excitement at the success of it, a man who was watching said quietly, 'That thing's no use and I'll prove it.' So they had another test, and all went well for a time, and then suddenly the man who was controlling the model found that the thing wouldn't do as he wanted it, but went right off on its own. It was very puzzling until they found out the cause of the trouble. The man who said it was useless was at work with another set of apparatus, a more powerful set, and that was the reason the great men looked blank. It failed—because a greater power could master it and make it quite useless.

This is the great thing I got hold of from my talk with the torpedo man. There is a twofold power stronger than we are—a power for good and a power for evil. We are like that model battleship in one way: we are governed by the power of God our Father, for He has made us and has that power over us. It is not a hard, cruel power, nor is it that of a policeman waiting to catch us out. No! It is the power of Love—a power that draws us to our Father. But there is another power, greater than we are too. It is the power with the down-pull, the power of evil, and it can and does often conquer the power of God in us. We know that only too well, don't we? But which is the greater power? It just depends what we say about it. We can choose for ourselves. The ship couldn't choose, but you can and you must. We have to choose our Leader and we have got to fight. It's not easy, it's very hard, because however hard we fight there is always that bad other self poking in and saying, 'What about me?'

St. Paul found it out and was not ashamed to tell us, 'When I want to do good, and be glad and happy and helpful, the bad old spirit is there, telling me it's no use trying to be good and helpful to others—no use at all! that I might just as well do what nearly everybody else does when things begin to get troublesome and I find myself "up against it." Just give up! In my heart I serve the master-spirit of good and love and light, but I seem to have another self that wants to serve the dark, bad master spirit of evil.' That's what St. Paul discovered, and you can make the same discovery any time you like, and I know you'll say, 'You're right.' Perhaps you have found it out already. You know how nice it is to lie in bed in the holidays or on Sunday mornings. You know, too, how a voice comes and says, 'Get up, old lazy-bones; what about giving a hand to mother, who's often "up against it" in doing her best to make you comfy and happy?' You've heard that voice, haven't you? And you've heard the other old dragon-voice too, that says sleepily and with a big yawn, 'Why should I?' And sometimes the bad old self has conquered, and you've rolled over and gone off to slumberland again. But sometimes, just now and again, the other voice has got the better of you, and out you've jumped, and felt that it was the best day you'd spent for a long time. And you're like the battleship, you're always in danger of being deflected from the path of serving Jesus into the mean, unhappy, selfish service of the bad old spirit of evil. This is the good news—that the power of love can conquer the other power. You've got to long for it to live in you. No sneaking longings for the bad spirit with its snappy, snarly, 'I want that and I'll have it, too,' or 'You're a nasty, horrid thing, and I'll not play with you again.'

What we need to know is, that there is really a greater power to make the other powerless. Which is the greater power? That's for you to say. If you are keen to serve Jesus, He is the greater Power. If you prefer the black, horrid things, the unkind word, the angry look; if you find that you don't mind cribbing, or that you are not particular whether you've got your own pen, or bat, or anything else that isn't yours, it looks as though you are telling everybody that the stronger power for you is the 'spirit of disobedience.' And that power will slowly deflect your aim, so that you can't aim straight.

It is easy to give way to the bad spirit; that is why there are so many unhappy folk about. But we can and we must aim at kind, helpful things; at happy thoughts and brave, cheerful kindnesses; specially when we are feeling a bit like saying, 'I wonder whether it is really worth it.' I like to think that the laddie who gave his lunch to Jesus gave it after a bit of a struggle, knowing well that he might get nothing to eat till he got home, and it was evening then. But just watch his face as Jesus goes on breaking and breaking his little biscuits and dried fishes and with them feeds a whole crowd of people. It's worth it being unselfish. But it means keeping true to your aim, reminding yourself of it every day, and fighting to keep from the things that would deflect it.

Wings.

By the Reverend Alexander Small, B.D., Boreham Wood, Herts.

'Oh that I had wings!'—Ps 55^6.

Were you not thrilled when you heard that Miss Amy Johnson had flown by herself across the world to Australia? Didn't you feel how brave she was, how daring, how clever? No wonder the King and Queen sent a message to her saying how pleased they were. Didn't it make you feel you wanted to do something brave too? With the wings of an aeroplane she braved the dangers of the air and mountains, and jungle and sea. I wonder if you said to yourself, 'I wish I had wings.'

Hundreds of years ago, long before there were balloons, or airships, or monoplanes, or biplanes, a man wanted to fly. One day he said to himself, 'Oh that I had wings!' But he didn't want wings because he was brave; he didn't want them because he wanted to face dangers and difficulties. Oh dear, no! He wanted them because he was afraid, because he was in danger, because life was hard, and he wanted to get away to some safe place where things would be easier for him. He had a fit of the blues, and so he said to himself, 'Oh that I had wings like a dove! Then would I fly away, and be at rest.' He wanted God to give him wings; but God wouldn't give him the wings he wanted, and as he knew nothing of airships or aeroplanes, he just had to stay where he was and face his dangers, and fight his difficulties, and overcome his fears, and God gave him something better than wings, He gave him courage and strength.

I wonder if you ever feel as that man did long ago. When you've got some hard lesson to learn at school, some difficult problem to do, do you want to get away from it to do something easier?

When mother wants you to do something for her, to water the flowers or to run an errand, do you pretend you don't hear, or do you feel like slipping out of the back door to your friends, whose voices you hear as they are playing in the street? That's just like saying, 'I wish I had wings.' But it's no good wishing. You haven't any wings, and it will be a long, long time before you feel them growing out of your shoulders. It's a good thing God hasn't given you wings to get away from difficulties and hardships. God won't give you wings to fly away, but He will give you the wings of love that will make you brave, and keep you true, and help you to face your difficulties and overcome them. That is something very much better, isn't it? And if you live day by day like that, doing the hard thing, life will be very beautiful; and if you do not receive a message from King George saying how brave you are, you will have something even better, the 'Well done' from the King of kings.

The Christian Year.

SIXTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

Jonathan.

'O Jonathan, thou wast slain in thine high places. I am distressed for thee, my brother Jonathan: very pleasant hast thou been unto me: thy love to me was wonderful, passing the love of women.'—2 S 1$^{25, 26}$.

There are two contrasted orders of saints. One kind reaches the heights of life only with difficulty: temptations have ever beset them: they have had to fight a long and strenuous battle for the possession of their souls. Others seem to be saints quite naturally and spontaneously, like those rarely fortunate ones of whom Wordsworth tells:

> There are who ask not if thine eye
> Be on them; who, in love and truth,
> Where no misgiving is, rely
> Upon the genial sense of youth:
> Glad Hearts! without reproach or blot;
> Who do thy work, and know it not.

Jonathan is one of that lovelier order. He walks on the heights of life, and we see no marks of any inward conflict or strain.

We do not give to such men the credit they are due. Their goodness seems so easy, the natural blossom of their souls. The perfection of anything is a shy quality: its mark is a seeming effortlessness, an unconscious harmony and ease which do not obtrude or draw attention to themselves; and so it escapes observation. But what more delights the seeing eye? And let us not imagine that the story of such as Jonathan is only an old story of long ago that touches us not. The saints are our bread of life. And when the story of a noble life is told and we see how lovely the character of man may be, we are listening to the voice of God whose unearthly music alone can recreate the soul.

Jonathan reveals the high quality of his soul in his relations with two men—David his friend and his father Saul.

1. In the real estimate of things, to love is greater than to be loved. That is not our ordinary thought. We take love as an evidence of the worth of the beloved. And Jonathan's passionate attachment to David becomes in our eyes only another gilding of the hero of Bethlehem. And certainly there must have been a rare charm about the shepherd lad of Bethlehem. There was his generosity and chivalry, so strange and remarkable in these rude days; his poetic sensibility that flashed in lovely image and arresting phrase; the power of song to which we are all so susceptible; and the physical beauty that gladdens the eye.

Love is its own rich and rare reward—when it is given to the worthy. Life has no greater blessing in its varied store. And Jonathan would not have counted his friendship for David among his virtues; he would have counted it his chiefest joy, for it made his days bright and full. But we can see the price it cost him: we can note the rare quality and amount of its unselfishness. For all worldly interest cried aloud against it. He could keep his love and friendship only in despite of pride and vanity and ambition.

First of all, David soon outstripped him in the people's favour; he became his successful rival in the race for glory. Now we have all a spice of vanity in us. It is Nature's provision that none of her children shall lack some savour in life, some spring of fresh hope and energy amid life's contradictions and disappointments. And there is nothing so intoxicating to human vanity as the glory whose stage is the wide resounding theatre of public life. Fame, says Milton, is the last infirmity of noble minds. When men have drunk of that heady draught, the thirst for it seldom leaves them. And Jonathan had drunk of it; he knew its intoxicating thrill. For he was the hero of Mich-mash. But now the shepherd lad of Bethlehem has come; he has slain Goliath. And the fickle populace have turned to him. To man's proud heart it is gall and wormwood to see another outstripping him in the race for fame. Jonathan saw it; he went through that fieriest of trials and neither smoke nor smell of fire passed upon him. That reveals the sterling generosity in his soul.

And what of ambition, the dear desire for place and power? Now the monarchy was not as yet firmly established in the line of Saul. Any strong man who could capture popular favour might aspire to be king over at least some portion of the community. That was the possibility emerging for David. Saul saw it, for hatred, like love, sharpens the sight. And he said to his son, 'So long as David liveth, thou shalt not be established nor thy kingdom.' Jonathan knew it well, for once he said to his friend, 'Thou shalt be king in Israel, and I shall be next to thee.' That was his glad acceptance of his destiny. When Henry of Navarre was taunted with his change of religion he said gaily, 'Paris surely is worth a mass.' Was not the throne of Saul his father worth fighting for? Jonathan gave it up unrebellingly. Had we not known that he was a brave soldier we might have said, Here is the policy of a craven spirit: he takes the second place who will not fight for the first. But Jonathan had no need to consider his reputation for courage: that was safe.

To the world's surprise that spiritual greatness shall be revealed some day. Here when men are successful we heap more and more laurels on their heads. This world worships the favourites of fortune. It is not so with God. In His presence the second oftentimes are first; shall not He who humbled Himself to the Cross hail him as one like-minded with Himself, a kindred soul who can enter into the fellowship of His mind and share in the inward rapture of His heart?

2. The other personal relation in which we see Jonathan is toward his father King Saul. That relationship is apt to be overlooked. But Jonathan shows himself as fine and perfectly tempered towards his father as towards David. And this side of his life and character is summed up for us in the tragedy on Mount Gilboa.

Must not Jonathan have been torn in twain as his father determined to do battle with the Philistines? He had been his father's right hand always. Saul had not been always a mere gloomy tyrant; he had a kingly nature, though at the last this was buried deep under the convulsions wrought by his jealousy of David: there had been possibilities of greatness where Jonathan would love to trace the real lineaments of the man. But with the clear vision that love gives, he must have seen the dark, fateful ending drawing nigh. King Saul had come to despair of himself; he felt abandoned by God and even by the soldier-like qualities of his early days. And he went to consult witches and soothsayers. The battle with the Philistines was the gambler's last throw of the dice. Should he gird on his armour and go with Saul to the hopeless fight, or should he withdraw to David with whom was the promise of a brighter to-morrow? How many conflicts are there in the inward soul of a man, that none knows, where the greatest of issues are at stake! Jonathan's answer was to gird on his armour and confront death.

Certain lines of Keats tell the secret of all true spiritual greatness:

> He ne'er is crown'd
> With immortality, who fears to follow
> Where airy voices lead.

That is no maxim of worldly prudence. But the men of real value, those who count in the long run and are not mere bubbles in the current, must have an ear to catch the soundless melodies of the spirit. The world will praise thee when thou doest well for thyself. So says the Psalmist, indulging in unusual irony. Jonathan will never earn such praise. The voices to which he listened called him to the second place, the shaded light of a more brilliant soul: they called him to support a failing cause, to venture his all in a desperate enterprise. But he never hesitated. These voices of love and loyalty were, his heart knew, the voice of God, for all the sweetness and the nobleness of life, all that makes a man respect himself, and shows him his life in a setting of glory, were in them.

As we follow that old-world story; as we contemplate his life and death, and think of all he was as well as of all he enjoyed and suffered, shall we not say—'Jonathan chose the better part: be my soul with him and with all the generous and the loyal, the loveliest and best of our race!'[1]

SEVENTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

The Friendless.

'Woe to him that is alone when he falleth; for he hath not another to help him up.'—Ec 4¹⁰.

The preacher here is calling for pity upon him that is alone when he falleth. He is thinking of suffering. But we may permit ourselves to think of moral catastrophe.

Do we recognize the fact that, many a time, it is not viciousness of disposition or outstanding weakness of will—certainly not deliberate choice of evil—that sends men on a downward path, but just sheer, dreary loneliness? Yes! and a loneliness that is only accentuated by nominal membership in a great city community. In the country-places, with the mountains and the sea and within him his heart to bear witness, a man may be alone rather than lonely. It is in the city, though round us crowds may be moving, that solitariness has its dwelling. As a man walks down a street, each lighted window speaks to him of companionship. Let him ring one of the bells and claim companionship! He laughs to think of the blank stares that would greet his intrusion. Companionship for them; and, all the more for that, loneliness for him. As he reflects bitterly, a group of friends pass him. They laugh together, intent the one on the other. But for him they have no more heed than for an inhabitant of another planet. What wonder if such a man, when night after night he returns to the solitude of his lodgings, reflects that companionship of a sort can be bought, or a temporary oblivion imbibed?

---

[1] R. Glaister, *The Beauty of the Lord*, 81.

Now, it ought to be the part of the Christian Church to supply something of this lack. Certainly, in the first place, in regard to its own members. The Christian Church is a Christian family. So we are taught in the Lord's Supper. We must devise means of making that a more practical ideal. I know that there are difficulties, but we might open our houses more. Many congregations, I believe, do try to meet this problem. The ideal will be reached when, if a man or woman shall come and say that he or she is friendless, ministers will be able, in reply, to hand over their Communion Rolls, with the suggestion that these contain the names of, say, nine hundred odd friends for a start. There, at any rate, in one clear way, we shall be bearing one another's burdens and thus fulfilling the law of Christ.

Moreover, we shall be fulfilling the intention of man's Creator. The Almighty does not intend us to be alone; for He setteth the solitary in families. Which reminds us of a most important duty: keep strong and true the family bond. Endure, yield, be charitable up to the last limit of principle rather than break it.

But, when all is said and done, a certain loneliness is the portion of us all. There is a quality of loneliness in life's trials, and there is certainly a loneliness in our sins, from which we cannot escape. And it is there that we need to be reminded of the fact of Christ in God.

Now, for us to go to the solitary whom we could help and tell them that God loves them, and then leave them to that reflection, is manifest insincerity. But it is not dealing with a vain thing for us to remind ourselves of the fact of the nearness of God in relation to trouble that must be borne alone.

First, let us remember that the Lord Christ knows that inner solitariness of our hearts through and through. It was His chief trial. He trod the winepress *alone*. There was no man—none to hear and none to answer. The burden and the shadow fell on Him; and the rest knew not that there was a burden or a shadow. If we bear the unspoken trial bravely, we are in His steps; and He is not far from them that follow Him.

And, second, if our loneliness be the loneliness of sin—and sin is always at the core lonely; Judas went out, and it was night—then let us remember God knows all about it, more than we do, and *still cares*. Yes, cares as Christ did; and that is, by the measurement of a Cross. If only that fact can bite into us, not only our solitariness, but our slavery, will die; and for our days here, in place of solitary guilt, there will be peace with God and the prospect of the satisfying of the heart's dearest desires, in the presence of the Father.[1]

EIGHTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

The Cure for Trouble.

'Let not your heart be troubled: ye believe in God, believe also in me.'—Jn 14¹.

Is there a cure for trouble? Let us consider a few of the replies that have been given to this question.

1. The first remedy to be considered is the Stoic remedy. The Stoics of old maintained that there is a cure for trouble, that there is a means of healing the cruel aching of the heart, and their name for that cure was *Apathy*. 'Let all passion, all ardent attachment, die out of your nature,' they counselled. 'Give it all up. Desire nothing; hope for nothing. Accept the universe; take what comes; resign yourself patiently to the inevitable. The way of indifference is the way of peace.' Such was the teaching of Epictetus and Marcus Aurelius. And there are some persons in our own time who still find themselves attracted by the ancient Stoic wisdom.

Now it cannot be denied that there is something impressive and even splendid in the Stoic attitude. We cannot but admire the stern fortitude of these people. Nevertheless it is impossible to be satisfied with the Stoic remedy—simply for the reason that this cure for trouble costs too much. It can, indeed, in a great measure, make us dead to pain; but only by making us dead to joy as well as pain. And we simply cannot afford to pay so high a price. Even to be rid of trouble, we cannot, we dare not, sacrifice all the beauty and the brightness and the rich variety of our life. Let us look on the portraits of the Stoic worthies; observe their settled melancholy, their dreary impassivity, their utter lack of buoyancy and high-spirited enthusiasm; and then ask ourselves seriously whether we wish to become like them. Here, for instance, is Marcus Aurelius, emperor and philosopher, concerning whom a great scholar has written that 'Marcus had as little joy or hope as ever man had who got through a life of work without hanging himself.' Or here is George Eliot, coldly penning the famous letter in which, after comparing faith in God to 'taking opium,' she goes on to say, 'The highest "calling and election" is to do without opium, and live through all our pain with conscious, clear-eyed endurance.' Or here, again, is Matthew Arnold, another prophet of endurance, gazing out on the endless battle of good and evil in the world, and oh! so weary of the strife that goes on and on and on and never issues into victory:

---

[1] J. R. P. Sclater, *The Enterprise of Life*, 299.

> Creep into thy narrow bed,
> Creep, and let no more be said!
> Vain thy onset! all stands fast.
> Thou thyself must break at last.
>
> Let the long contention cease!
> Geese are swans, and swans are geese.
> Let them have it how they will!
> Thou art tired: best be still.

Love and joy and sympathy and hope and noble ambition are things too precious to be jettisoned, even for the sake of bringing the ship of the soul to anchorage in what Marcus Aurelius calls 'the untroubled peacefulness of a waveless bay.'

2. The second cure for trouble, in default of a better description, may be named the *Pleasure-Cure.* The idea of it is that a man may checkmate pain by plunging over head and ears into pleasurable distraction. 'Stifle your pain with amusements. Forget it in excitements.'

But does the pleasure-prescription answer? Probably it often does in the case of the minor troubles of life. When one is worried or annoyed, it may be the best thing one can do to dine out or go to the theatre, and forget the annoyance if only for an evening. After the temporary respite one is fitter to contend with the obnoxious matter. But the pleasure-cure works only in the case of the lesser troubles; it breaks down irretrievably where the greater troubles are concerned. A mother is told in one day that her two soldier sons have fallen in the war; a literary man, who gets his living by his writing, discovers that he is doomed to blindness; a husband sees his idolized wife fading away beneath his eyes for want of common necessaries which he is too poor to procure for her—will we venture to tell such people to go away, and divert themselves, and have some fun, and forget their troubles? We may endeavour by this means to narcotize our suffering, but no pleasure can give us lasting alleviation, and the suffering continues with us just the same; only now it has become the suffering of a cowardly and degraded mind, 'which,' as says Romola in George Eliot's novel, 'is the one form of sorrow which has no balm in it.'

3. Let us notice one other prescription. If we cannot find a cure for trouble in apathy or in pleasure, may we find it, perhaps, in *Work*—in doing the daily duty, in carrying out the allotted task conscientiously and strenuously, in fulfilling the engagement? Is work the way to peace? That was the conviction of the great novelist, Émile Zola. Some twenty years ago Zola addressed to the students of Paris a remarkable oration in which he spoke of his own work and of the consolation it had brought to him. 'I,' said he, 'have had but one faith, one strength—work! What has sustained me was the enormous labour I set myself. . . . How often in the morning have I sat down to my table . . . tortured by some great sorrow, physical or mental! And each time—in spite of the revolt my suffering has caused—after the first moments of agony, my task has been to me an alleviation and a comfort.' And he continued, 'From the time one accepts the task, and from the time one begins to fulfil it, it seems to me that tranquillity should come even to the most tormented.'

But work is not genuinely remedial, although it is a great help. Work by itself cannot mend a broken heart.

4. So far, then, we have failed to find by human ingenuity an effectual cure for trouble. Let us now turn to One who is named the Good Physician. What remedy has He to offer? 'Let not your heart be troubled: ye believe in God, believe also in me.' This is the *Religion-cure,* and somehow it seems to go down to the very root of the matter. Let us observe for a moment its terms. First, 'ye believe in God.'

When the Cardinal Legate from Rome had an interview with Luther at Augsburg, he said to him furiously: 'The Pope's little finger is stronger than all Germany. Do you expect your princes to take up arms to defend *you*? I tell you, No! And where will you be then?' And Luther answered, 'Where I am now: in the hands of Almighty God.' And it was the same Luther who used often to say to Melanchthon in the stormy days of the Reformation: 'Come, Philip, let us sing the forty-sixth psalm, "God is our refuge and strength, a very present help in trouble."' Yes, to be certain of God, to be certain that God cares for us, to be certain that God knows all about our suffering, and is controlling it to the working out of a wise and beneficent purpose, to be certain that, even in the most desperate circumstances and situation, we are still grasped and sustained by a Providence that we can absolutely trust—this is to be mailed against adversity. In the strength of such faith in God, we can confront 'the slings and arrows of outrageous fortune'; we can echo the words of Pascal, 'Thou alone knowest what is expedient for me. . . . Give to me or take away from me, only conform my will to Thine'; we can say with General Gordon, 'My Friend is with me, and I am quieted with the knowledge of His rule'; we can sing with the Quaker poet:

In all the maddening maze of things,
And tossed by storm and flood,
To one fixed state my spirit clings—
I know that God is good.

'Ye believe in God'—that first. But let us not forget the second clause of Christ's prescription—'Believe also in me.' Jesus our Lord, Jesus Himself—is He not at once the example and the guarantee of a heart untroubled in the midst of trouble? He came and lived this troubled life of ours. He drank of the cup of sorrow. And this, that He might show us how to triumph over trouble, and change 'the bitter water of our affliction into the wine of joy and gladness.' The Man of Sorrows offers Himself as Sorrow's Healer. And as we look on Him, and conform ourselves to His image, do we not learn to meet our troubles with the same heavenly mind? We share His unfaltering trust in the love of God, His willing and cheerful acceptance of the all-righteous Will of God, His eagerness to devote Himself at any cost to God's service; and, sharing so much, we share also His happy experience of inward peace in the midst of outward agitation. Let us think of Carlyle's magnificent apostrophe to Marie Antoinette, led bound to her execution: 'Far as the eye reaches, a multitudinous sea of maniac heads; the air deaf with their triumph-yell! The Living-dead must shudder with yet one other pang; her startled blood yet again suffuses with the hue of agony that pale face, which she hides with her hands. There is, then, *no* heart to say, God pity thee? O, think not of these; think of Him whom thou worshippest, the Crucified,—who also treading the wine-press *alone*, fronted sorrow still deeper; and triumphed over it, and made it holy; and built of it a "Sanctuary of Sorrow," for thee and all the wretched!'[1]

Ninth Sunday after Trinity.

The Father of Jesus.

'God, even the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ.'—Ro 15^6.

This is the most daring and the most evolutionary title that was ever given to God by men. Yet to-day it often falls from our lips, a grandiloquent and sonorous phrase from which the meaning has well-nigh faded.

1. Wherever the expression occurs in the New Testament, it always betrays a mounting wave of emotion in the writer's breast. In the religious lands of the East the pious worshipper never uses the name of God without muttering after it, 'Blessed be His name.' The first Christians never spoke the words, 'The Father of our Lord Jesus,' without murmuring some such words of adoration, 'Blessed be He!' All the feelings of awe and reverence and self-abasement which used to visit these sons of a desert faith when they thought on the Nameless One—the Unseen, the Eternal, the Supreme—transferred mysteriously and made to cluster round the words, 'The Father of Jesus!' When they wanted to make the most solemn asseveration, as if under the All-seeing Eye, it was the Father of our Lord they called to witness. 'The God and Father of our Lord Jesus,' wrote Paul in that letter of vehement, protesting sorrow to the recalcitrant Church at Corinth, 'The God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, who is blessed for evermore, knoweth that I lie not.' The sound of the words was a summons to worship and to glorify. It is so in the example we have chosen as a text, chosen merely because it is the first occasion of its use in the New Testament. All the others are either in thanksgiving or in prayer, benediction, or doxology. At the very beginning of the letter to Colosse, Paul writes: 'We give thanks to God, even the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, praying always for you.' It is an opening doxology

---

[1] F. H. Dudden, *The Delayed Victory*, 17.

in the Epistle to the Ephesians: 'Blessed be the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, who hath blessed us with all spiritual blessings in heavenly places in Christ.' In the heart of that Epistle we see the outward as well as the inward demeanour which the words inspired: 'I bow my knees unto the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, in whom every family in heaven and on earth is named.' It comes at length as a ray of heavenly sunlight after the storm-clouds had rolled away from Corinth: 'Blessed be God, even the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, the Father of mercies and the God of all comfort.' For two nights and a day the forbidding Cross has kept a broken-hearted disciple from unsaying his denial; but he has hardly put pen to paper long after, when in a burst of doxology we catch the reflection of the Resurrection glory which scattered his despair: 'Blessed be God, even the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, who according to his abundant mercy hath begotten us again to a living hope by the raising of Jesus Christ from the dead.'

2. Perchance, to-day, we might get back behind the cold, formal ring it seems to have too often when we thrust it into our devotions, and recall a few faint gleams of its old radiance by pondering over it in humble meditation. 'The Father of our Lord Jesus'—let us try to carry the words back on the wings of fancy to the quiet circle of the hills round Nazareth, and to the shores of the Lake of Galilee.

On the streets of the little country town we meet a young man as He goes to and from His day's work with His tool-bag slung over His shoulder. And when we venture to exchange greetings with Him, we pass on with a vague and puzzled impression of something not quite ordinary about the Man. What sort of home has He sprung from?

The days pass, and led by some impulse we turn in to converse with Him by the bench, for we want to know Him closer. And He lifts upon us great, dark, luminous eyes. And the unsolved puzzle in our minds about His pedigree gives way to a feeling of startled wonder. That something about the Man had nothing to do with the delicacy of human nurture. It is a rare thing that stands confronting us. To use an expressive phrase of the street to-day, it is a white soul.

Days pass, and weeks, and we meet Him again by the Lake, a Teacher with a few unlettered followers round Him, and the crowds hanging upon His words. Suppose we approach one of these disciples and begin to question him. . . . 'You ask me why do I follow Him? Why, because He has brought me into the presence of God. Yes, He knows God, knows the Most High, the Ever Blessed One. No, I never inquired about His parents, or His home.' . . . And the flame kindles in his eyes as, with a sudden access of conviction that takes your breath away, the disciple says, 'The God of Jesus, the God the Master is always speaking of—and speaking to—*He* is the Father of Jesus. I cannot tell how, but I know. He has made me so sure, so sure. Come with me and listen to Him awhile.' And we draw near and listen.

Yes, He is talking about Someone, very reverently and yet in the most *intimate* and familiar way. A breath blows out of the open skies and fans your cheek—a breath from the Unseen. Gentle and pure like the trembling light from a pulsing star, but convinced that He was sent; sensitive, yet all His sensitiveness transformed into Divine strength—He seems to be speaking about Someone who is beside Him, all about Him—lending a glory to the red lily at His feet; a joy to the wheeling flight of the birds overhead; a wave of life beating down through the sunshine that sweeps along the hillside; falling through the rain on the springing corn in the valley; and whispering in His heart. Someone all-great, all-knowing, without whom not a sparrow falls, who sees in secret, who can be spoken to anywhere, and, best of all, alone. He calls Him the heavenly Father.

And in the twilight, as we climb the hillside, the memory of those eyes of arresting purity, and the radiant smile, and the strong reposeful face, comes back to us. And His words, startling in their beauty, their depth, their simplicity—why, they were alive! . . . Mad? *He* mad? Nay, but the one soul of perfect sanity in a world awry! It is we—we, who are suffering from illusions—great thick clouds of suspicion and doubt and care and fear, that shut God out of life. And as we approach the hill-top when the first few faint stars begin to show, we hear the voice of one engaged in earnest talk. Dimly we discern a figure all alone. And faintly, borne on the night breeze, we catch at intervals the words, 'O my Father,' 'Holy Father,' 'O Father, Lord of heaven and earth.' And we steal away. We, too, have become like the disciple fisherman. Without another question we repeat, 'The God of Jesus is the Father of Jesus. I know not how or why, but it is so.'

3. We think of Him as the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, not merely because Jesus was so intimate with Him, but because Jesus was so *satisfied* with Him. But in those remote highland glens of Galilee, what could He know, we are fain

to ask, of the great world with its passions of greed and hate and lust that drench the world with blood, its envy and its misery, its sorrow and shame, its anguish and despair? His was a sheltered life, and in solitary brooding and communing with God among the hills He never had need to question Him about the darkness and sorrow of the world.

To say that Christ knew little of life because He was not a city child in touch with the great world is simply to blind one's eyes to the truth. All the known facts of His life are dead against it. He knew what sorrow meant, and hunger. He had stood by the dying Joseph's bed. Chief mourner, He had followed the coffin to the grave—only a boy. He knew what cruelty and avarice could be when turned against an unprotected widow mother. He had to battle with temptation in most powerful forms, and with despair. Yet there never flitted across His mind so much as a shadow of dissatisfaction with the God who kept Him company all the time. Shall not God clothe you—feed you, as He clothes the lilies, feeds the birds? Your heavenly Father knows. He greatly cares. Looking up to God in every vicissitude of life, He was perfectly satisfied with Him.

But more than that, beside sin and misery, in their most tangled and hopeless forms, He found the forgiving love of God equal to the worst that the human soul could bring upon itself. To the bitter end He was perfectly satisfied with God.

'To the bitter end?' What, then, of the agony of the Garden? Was that not a wrestling of His human will with God's? No, it was not even a questioning of God's will for Him, as He staggered beneath the burden. But as the shadows were deepening round Him, He saw one awful spot on the way ahead of Him. That the intimate fellowship with His Father should be broken even for a moment—that was what He fain would forgo. But He only prayed, 'If it be possible, let this cup pass.' And all the time of that dread agony and sweat and prayer the name on His lips was 'Father.' It is because Peter could not forget the almost unbearable pathos of it, when he tells the story, that he quotes the very word of His mother-speech which Jesus used on this occasion, 'Abba! Abba!'—still satisfied.

But that awful cry of God-forsakenness from the Cross? Was not all His satisfaction in God disannulled by that word? Nay, He is still crying up to God through the black pall that lay upon His soul. And how does He address Him? Does He cry, 'O God, if there be a God?' Does He say, 'Great and terrible unseen Being, whoever you are?' No, but '*My* God, *My* God.' Oh, the love that would not let God go, even in that hour of shuddering eclipse on the Cross! Oh, the love and trust that conquered with a sigh: 'Father, into thy hands I commend my spirit'!

How perfect must be the God who could satisfy such a man! A stainless, flawless soul—there must be no shadow cast by turning, no darkness at all in the God who could satisfy such as He. Greater love was never shown by man for men than by this Jesus on the Cross. Surely the God with whom He was well pleased must be a great Well of love unutterable.[1]

[1] J. A. Robertson, in *United Free Church Sermons*, 180.

'The Cambridge Ancient History' and the Old Testament.

By the Reverend W. M. Mathieson, B.D., Broughty Ferry.

II.

The Old Testament History.

We use the term 'The Old Testament History' to indicate the period and the events covered by the narrative portions of OT Scripture, namely, the sixteen hundred years or so from the era of Hebrew origins in Abraham to the time of the consolidation of ecclesiastical or theocratic Judaism under Nehemiah and Ezra. This epoch, roughly 2000–400 B.C., constitutes the range of national incidents and developments with which the Biblical writers deal in those books of Jewish Sacred Scripture which may be described as historical. These OT records have been surveyed in a previous article as we see them scrutinized, and their value estimated, in the pages of the *C.A.H.* by the scientific historical student. In the present article we proceed to consider how the OT history emerges when the sources, Biblical and external, have been examined and used by the present-day historian, such as Dr. S. A. Cook in the relevant chapters of the first six volumes of the *C.A.H.*

The advantage of studying the OT history in these volumes (I., II., III., and VI. are those which contain chapters dealing directly with the Biblical material) is that we are enabled to view it in its true international relationships. Any presentation of OT history must, of course, bring in nations other than the Israelites; the Bible itself contains many references to foreign peoples. But in such a case the surrounding peoples appear rather as 'background,' with the OT events and personages engaging the attention in a dominating manner. In the *C.A.H.* each nation of the ancient world of South-West Asia and the Mediterranean from time to time steps into the foreground, while the others form the background. One's point of view is constantly being shifted,and one is enabled to survey the whole historical field in truer perspective and proportions. When, in the course of this process, the OT history comes at various eras into our more immediate field of vision we are in a position to look at it with a new interest and power of apprehension. Probably two impressions are left on the mind, impressions which might seem at first to be contradictory.

One effect of viewing the OT history in the context of the *C.A.H.* is that it *shrinks*. When the OT itself was our chief source for ancient history the Israelite story bulked large and significant: Palestine and its people during the Biblical epoch filled a great space in the history of mankind's past. As we see it now, Israelite history is no less significant from the spiritual standpoint; it is even more extraordinary and meaningful and pregnant. But it is much less significant—and this helps to enhance its spiritual pre-eminence—from the purely political standpoint. It was hardly ever, save to some extent at the epoch of David and Solomon, a truly independent national history. Other national and imperial powers literally walked over it and through it and round it, obscuring its existence and often threatening it with extinction. Nor was it by any means a very ancient history. Archæological finds and historical investigation are raising curtain after curtain which had hidden the ancient world from us. Even when traced back to its Hebrew beginnings in the Abrahamic migration, contemporary probably with Babylon's Golden Age under Hammurabi and with the Twelfth Dynasty in Egypt, Israel's story comes after the most brilliant periods of ancient history: politically it may be described as quite a *fin de siècle* affair. Further, Hebrew-Israelite-Judaic history is not only dwarfed when our view of the long and complicated story of the Semitic Middle East is enlarged; it is still further diminished when we realize that the ancient Semitic world was itself no more a closed and independent system than was the OT history. The Semitic empires and cultures of Amurru (Syria and eastwards towards the Euphrates), Babylonia, and Assyria were in many respects the heirs of an earlier non-Semitic power, the Sumerians. Elamites, too, played their part in the early history of Mesopotamia. In the northern regions Indo-European influence made itself felt through the Hittite confederation in Asia Minor, and also by the channel of Mitanni. Westward, non-Semitic influences also came in from the region of the Ægean and the Levant. Egypt likewise was constantly penetrating Palestine and Syria, through seaports and by landward routes, with her armies and civilization. While the Semitic area and its more or less indigenous inhabitants always exercised a strong power of Semitization upon incomers, it now appears to be more and more difficult to say what constitutes distinctive Semitic culture and racial character. Thus, with the widening of racial horizons and the lengthening of historical vistas, the OT history has shrunk.

At the same time, that history has been *enriched*—enriched with new details and fresh points of contact with other national stories. If in one sense it has shrunk, in another sense it has been enlarged; that is the second impression left by considering the Israelite people in the setting provided by the *C.A.H.* Not only has the course of events with which the OT deals suffered no spiritual diminution or impoverishment, it has been linked up in many interesting and important ways with the wider world. While the OT writers make clear the religious significance of the events they are describing, modern utilization of external evidence often helps us to see the international implications of these same events. If the scale of the stage has been reduced as regards the internal history of Israel, the interaction of causes and effects in the drama has sometimes been made clearer and the interplay of tribal and national influences has been made more intelligible.

We see the importance from the point of view of high imperial politics, and of race movements, of the little land in which Israel's 'children' found a home. We see them not just as an isolated and self-contained family. Their kinship with some of their neighbours, and the consequences of that kinship, are more evident and meaningful, as are also the ways in which their family life, while maintaining its special characteristics, was diversified or threatened by intrusive elements. The windows of Israel's house have been flung open in various directions, and we are able to look out of them and see something of the world of men and events that met Israel's eyes, motived Israel's actions, helped to feed Israel's mind, and often perplexed Israel's spirit. God's training and discipline of Israel take a new point and definiteness as we see the nation in its various reactions to, and interactions with, peoples of higher political and cultural but lower spiritual achievements.

If, however, when we turn to the special OT chapters in the *C.A.H.* we expect to find that Dr. Cook has presented us with a clearer outline of Israelite history, a more easily grasped sequence of development, and a more closely articulated scheme of periods and phases, we shall be grievously disappointed. While most minutely analysing and ransacking the available OT sources—indeed, as a result of so doing—and while utilizing all available external evidence—and again as a consequence of this—Dr. Cook finds himself forced to confess that it is impossible to present his readers with a reliable account of the whole process of Israelite history or with satisfying descriptions of most of its main epochs. Dr. Cook marshals all the material in the form which it assumes after stringent historical appraisement, and, in effect, leaves us with what is still material for history rather than history itself—material that cannot yet be fully utilized because insufficient in quantity and inadequate in quality. His conscience as a scientific writer of history will not allow him to present reconstructions of many of the periods, because he does not believe that a dependable and defensible reconstruction is yet possible. This reluctance of Dr. Cook to reconstruct the history in any kind of detail is due to the fact, noted in our first article, that he sets a low estimate on the historical value of the sources with which the OT provides us. Many will feel that the estimate is too low, and that the consequent hesitation to reconstruct the history is at some points excessive. Such will find some consolation in the view of one of our most eminent historians of the ancient east, Dr. H. R. Hall, from whose pen comes the following[1]: 'The present writer takes a somewhat more hopeful view than Dr. Cook of the possibility of reconstituting the early history of Israel from the admittedly often self-contradictory Jewish legends aided by contemporary monumental evidence. At any rate, it is the duty of the historian to try to make as probable a reconstruction as he can on the basis of our knowledge, which means fitting the native legends preserved in the Old Testament as plausibly as he can into the framework provided by the contemporary data, at first Egyptian chiefly, later Assyrian. And as time goes on we shall be able to do this with greater certainty. Personally I am not disposed to admit that we have not reached quite reliable results already, especially on the archæological side.'

If Dr. Cook believes that the day for reconstruction, certainly for any kind of detailed or elaborate reconstruction, has not yet come, he has in his chapters assembled all the materials at present accessible for such reconstruction; and at the same time he has indicated many considerations and points of view which he believes must be taken into account in any rewriting of Israel's story. Nor is it to be imagined that the reader will leave Dr. Cook's pages uninstructed in the trend and significance of the OT history. Every era is treated, and an attempt made to let the student have a well-proportioned survey of what there is to be seen. We may therefore proceed to notice in very brief form what Dr. Cook has to say about some of the chief epochs.

Dr. Cook's account of *Abraham*, and the Biblical representation of national origins in connexion with him (I. 233–237), comes at the end of a description of the situation in Syria and Palestine towards the close of the third millennium B.C. Of events and conditions in that epoch the OT sources 'preserve only the faintest echoes'; the records, written from much later points of view and containing traditions of varying age and interest, 'proceed chiefly from Southern Palestine, and seek to explain how the great ancestors entered the land and made their way to the south.' Dr. Cook accepts the Abrahamic movement as contemporary with Hammurabi, the sixth king of the First Babylonian Dynasty; or at least he believes that the Biblical writers intended Abraham to be dated in that age.[2] He does not ascribe much value to Gn 14 as reliable historical evidence for Abraham and his age, even though Amraphel of Shinar is 'presumably' Hammurabi of Babylonia. The following quotation on this point introduces us to a characteristic feature (cf. I. 194, 222; and many references in the course of his chapters in the later volumes) of Dr. Cook's historical criticism of the Biblical records, namely, his insistence that so-called 'primitive' features in a narrative do not mean that the narrative is to be accepted as coming down from primitive times and as being of truly ancient date and origin. 'Tradition has doubtless preserved some genuine names and possible situations; but in its present form the narrative [Gn 14] is late, and it was especially in the Persian period (*c.* fifth century B.C.) that Babylonians themselves were keenly interested in the early relations between Elam and their land. The names Abram and Abraham are found in Babylonia in the First Dynasty—the latter as a small farmer—and we have seen that those of Jacob and (possibly) Israel are no less ancient, and that those of the Hebrews and perhaps Yahweh may be traced. But the names in the Biblical narratives are more ancient than what is said of them; and although certain social usages in Genesis can be illustrated from Hammurabi's code of laws, they are in no wise peculiar to that remote period and do not prove the antiquity of their context' (I. 236). As regards the general significance of the story of the Abrahamic migration, connecting the patriarch both with Ur and with Harran, Dr. Cook's point of view may be summarized in the following sentence: 'A relationship is felt, partly with Babylonia, partly with the semi-nomad Aramæan and related population of the desert, and partly, also, with the Aramæan and more or less Hittite districts of the more cultured Harran and the north' (I. 237).

---

[1] *The People and the Book* (1925), edited by the late Professor A. S. Peake, chapter on 'Israel and the Surrounding Nations,' p. 9, footnote 1.

[2] The date of Hammurabi's reign which formerly found much acceptance was 2123–2081 B.C. This is almost certainly too high. Professor Langdon would

Another originative and decisive period on which the Biblical narratives concentrate is the *Exodus.* That the exact period and the precise character of this event are still very far from being ascertained by use either of the Biblical sources or any available external evidence, is the conviction of Dr. Cook. The one point on which he seems quite clear is the absolute impossibility of finding a place for any such spectacular, sweeping, coherent and large-scale movement as the OT records narrate in the region and period to which it seems to be ascribed by the writers. In what period the event which forms the basis of the Biblical elaborated tradition should be located by the present-day historian, Dr. Cook confesses that he can give little guidance. Rejecting any dates before or after the Eighteenth and Nineteenth Egyptian Dynasties as chronologically improbable, he would tend to limit the admissible range to the period between Thutmose III. and Merneptah, *i.e.* roughly 1500–1200 B.C. Within that period falls the movement of the Habiru into Palestine (*c.* 1400–1370 B.C.) which is revealed in the Tell el-Amarna correspondence. But Dr. Cook gives no support to the idea that this can represent the Biblical Exodus and Conquest. 'The divergence between the conditions described in the OT and the contemporary evidence [of the Tell el-Amarna tablets] is crucial' (II. 357). The general conclusion reached by surveying contemporary conditions over a lengthy period and by an analysis of the various traditions combined in the Biblical account is somewhat as follows. Only some Israelite tribes were ever in Egypt: 'the historical kernel is the descent and exodus of some relatively small band' (II. 358). Further, the traditions of any such exodus from Egypt seem to have been influenced by the reminiscence of movements up into Palestine of nomads or semi-nomads from the region lying between the south of Judah and Egypt proper, a district which is a kind of eastern extension of Egypt. Traces are also preserved of tribal history indicating that some branches of the Israelite people had traditions of settlement in Palestine quite different from the story of a conquest following on a sojourn in Egypt. Indeed, the original patriarchal traditions do not seem to point forward to any other kind of occupation of the land than that which they themselves indicate. We noticed earlier in this article that the patriarchal movements, proceeding in the direction Schechem–Bethel–Hebron–Beer-sheba, tended to concentrate on the occupation of the southern region. We may here quote a passage which indicates a constant theme of Dr. Cook in his examination of the records and the history. It gives a clue to his view of the whole trend of events and of the character of many of the sources. Dealing with the settlement and distribution of the tribes in the land, he says: 'The importance of some specific body of southern tradition is, however, unmistakable, and it is further enhanced by what is known of the Levites, their distribution over Palestine, and their subsequent congregating round Jerusalem. The names of the Levitical divisions are closely connected with Moses and his family, and also with Judah and south Palestine, Edom included. Their entrance and distribution could

now put the reign at 2067–25; while others would reduce it much further, *e.g.* Dhorme to 1955–13 (*Revue Biblique*, July 1928, p. 376, in the course of an article on 'Abraham dans le Cadre de l'Histoire').

readily account for some of the traditions of migration and movement; and it is noteworthy that among the Biblical traditions are some which represent specifically south Palestinian and local standpoints, and that certain families of the scribes were akin to the clans who definitely claimed a south Palestinian or Edomite origin (1 Ch 2^{55}). In this way we could explain the *presence* in the OT of various traditions, although whether they are trustworthy is quite another question. Nor can we say that the historical events they reflect necessarily belong to the pre-monarchical age' (II. 368; cf. VI. 184–186).

In the *Age of the Monarchy*, alike at its inception and at various subsequent points, the considerations in the above quotation are kept in mind. For the initial period of the monarchy Dr. Cook on the whole tends to accept as trustworthy the representation which these south Palestinian sources give, although indicating that they probably contain reflection of the much later conditions of post-Exilic times in Judah. He stresses the importance of the investigations and results set forth by Ed. Meyer and B. Luther in *Die Israeliten und ihre Nachbarstämme* (1906). David's early career is to be dissociated from that of Saul as regards any personal relationship. He belongs to the south country and, as events develop, moves northwards into an almost alien district, his stay and rule at Hebron being a stage of progress as much geographical as political. In the subsequent monarchical period, from David's capture of Jerusalem right down to the fall of the city in 586 B.C., the division between north and south is emphasized, with its consequent lack of political cohesion despite certain times of rapprochement. This, however, was far from being an era of exclusiveness. Dr. Cook is insistent on the fact that all through these centuries there were new infusions from the nomadic or semi-nomadic neighbours of the Israelites. Whether introduced by conquerors, or more frequently introducing themselves as opportunity offered and the cultivated lands enticed, new-comers were a source of real strength, often bringing physical and spiritual reinforcement from the more austere life of the desert into the agricultural and urban life of Palestine. Throughout the history of the monarchical period it is made clear how Israelite power could expand only at such eras as the surrounding empires were either weak or preoccupied with their own concerns; hence the expansion under David and Solomon, and later in the time of Jeroboam II. of Ephraim and Uzziah of Judah. When Egypt or Assyria cared to intervene, the little Israelite kingdoms were helpless. And so the end came when, in the wake of Assyria and as heir to her conquests, Babylonia laid Jerusalem waste and made Judah desolate though not deserted.

When Dr. Cook brings us into the periods of the *Exile and Restoration* he stresses the importance of what happened in the land of Judah itself rather than among the exiles. While the historical sources of the OT for these periods are meagre, and the indications of the course of events in the years from the Return of 538 B.C. (a numerically insignificant movement in Dr. Cook's view) till the days of Ezra (whom Dr. Cook inclines to date *c.* 397 B.C., *i.e.* after Nehemiah) are scanty, yet the post-Exilic period contained certain events and vicissitudes which are indirectly witnessed to by the records of the whole preceding period of Israel's story. This is the age when the OT historical and other records took their present form; and, in the opinion of Dr. Cook, these documents betray conditions and points of view (a possible revolt against Persia under Zerubbabel, and a fresh disaster to Jerusalem in consequence; monarchical *versus* high-priestly ideas and ambitions; a time of relapse into primitive conditions reflected in writings originating or compiled in this age) of which we have no direct account. The various documentary sources P, D, and even JE all contain evidence of processes of compilation or authorship which are best explained by the circumstances of these obscure yet important generations of the inauguration of Judaism in the sixth–fifth centuries B.C.

If it be thought that in the *C.A.H.* the OT history receives a merely political or cultural treatment, let it be understood that, over and above those valuable sections which deal explicitly with the development of Israel's religion, the spiritual significance of the history is not lost sight of. To indicate this we may close with some eloquent words of Dr. Cook at the end of his contribution in vol. VI. (pp. 198 f.). 'Thus does the history of a petty people hidden away in the vast Persian Empire raise the profoundest problems of national genius, its contribution to the world's history, and the price it has to pay. The genius of Israel showed itself in her prophets, story-tellers and psalmists, and in her ideas of religion and history. Genius has its conspicuous defects: that of the Semites, and especially Israel, not least of all. Yet through her genius Israel's history was what it was; and she was able both to interpret and to shape her history in a way no other people has done or could do. No other people found and made their national history so supremely significant, so worthy of interpretation and of preservation. She alone of all peoples earned the right to set forth for mankind that which she learnt at the cost of heavy sacrifices. Poignant experiences and their re-expression in a theistic exposition of history constitute Israel's unique contribution, and this gift becomes doubly precious as fuller knowledge of the facts of ancient history is bringing a re-interpretation of the past which is placing the Old Testament and the function of Israel in a new and larger framework.'

Biblical Archaeology.

By the Reverend J. W. Jack, M.A., Glenfarg, Perthshire.

In the April *Quarterly Statement* of the Palestine Exploration Fund we have an interesting record of the research carried out by the Society since its inception in 1865. Almost every aspect of scientific, historical, and literary work has been undertaken, and the reports have appeared not only in the *Quarterly Statements* but in *Memoirs* and recently in *Annuals*. The value of such work to the Biblical student is evident, for the special legacy of Palestine can only be rightly understood when the conditions, resources, and material relics of the country are taken into account. Two or three years ago the Society widened its scope by entering into closer co-operation with the British School of Archæology in Jerusalem (established in 1919), and the two together are promoting a large amount of field-work in Palestine, and especially excavation on ancient sites. They hope to undertake at least one more spell of work to recover the remains of the earliest Jerusalem, already partially excavated in 1923–25 by Professor Macalister and Rev. Garrow Duncan, and again in 1928 under Mr. Crowfoot. It is possible that Ophel, the ancient Zion or city of David, and the site of the royal necropolis of the Kings of Judah, may yet yield archæological finds of surprising importance.

In addition to these and other British societies, there are numerous continental and American ones working in Palestine on similar lines, with the result that valuable archæological and documentary material, illustrative of Israelite life and thought, has been rapidly accumulating of late. At Megiddo (*Tell el-Mutesellim*), where the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago is at work, the numerous standing monoliths unearthed have now been identified as hitching-posts and supporting pillars in the stables, and this will affect the interpretation of similar monoliths elsewhere in Palestine, as at Taanach, Tell Fara, and Beth-shean. These 'tie-stones' are believed to have belonged to Solomon's stables, and if further discoveries of them are made at other cities, the Hebrew historian's claim that the great king had several cavalry centres and four thousand stalls for his horses may receive corroboration. At *Tell en-Nasbeh* (believed by some to be Mizpeh of Benjamin), seven miles north of Jerusalem, the recent discoveries of Dr. Badè reveal the existence of an enormous Israelite city, with suburbs outside the wall, testifying to a large and prosperous population in the period between Samuel and the Exile. At ancient Shiloh (*Seilûn*), a Danish expedition has been at work for some time, and has succeeded in unearthing some churches with interesting and beautiful mosaics. This is one of the sites which should prove of great interest to the Biblical student, for it has not only been a place of pilgrimage for Jews, Christians, and Moslems, but was the seat of early Israelite worship. It is one of the sites which, like Ai and Jericho, can assist in determining the date and character of the Hebrew conquest. At Mamre (*Râmet el-Khalîl*), where the well of Abraham is, most interesting discoveries have been made by A. E. Mader, working under German auspices. The site of Abraham's oak has, it is believed, been located, as well as that of his altar, and parts of a pavement (a *via sacra*) leading from the main road to an ancient sanctuary adjoining the well have been discovered. Canaanite and Israelite potsherds have been found, together with undoubted samples of pottery belonging to the First Bronze Age (2600–2000 B.C.). If, as Dr. Albright says, this place is 'unquestionably the true site of Mamre,' considerable light may yet be thrown on the life of Abraham and his family, who dwelt here so long.

At practically all the Palestinian sites which are being excavated the 'diggings' are yielding increasingly important results, inasmuch as each successive excavation benefits from the accumulated observations of its predecessors. Work is being carried on this year by American societies at Megiddo, Tell Beit Mirsim (sixteen miles south-west of Hebron), Tell Fara, Balâtah (Shechem), 'Ain Shems (Beth-Shemesh), Seilûn, Mughâret el-Wad, Tell Ghassûl, and by Professor Garstang at Jericho. The resumption of the long-discontinued operations by Harvard University at Samaria, where important ostraca were found, is also promised soon. With so many foreign scholars, in addition to British ones, at work on the buried cities of Palestine, the future augurs well for Biblical Archæology.

Recent Foreign Theology.

The Jewish Dispersion.[1]

Herr Georg Rosen, for fourteen years German consul at Jerusalem, interested himself in archæological and historical researches into early Judaism, but his manuscript was lost at Cairo in 1891. His son, Friedrich, also in the Eastern German service, edited notes made afresh by his father, and finally handed over the materials to Professor Georg Bertram of Giessen, who is responsible for the present shape of the thesis, which is enriched by many notes on the Old and the New Testaments.

The two theses of the monograph are not unfamiliar, and they are closely connected. One is, that the Diaspora was a mission enterprise, and the other, that the Phœnicians were absorbed in the Jewish nation thus expanding. Both contentions, especially the first, are, of course, rejected by many critics. Thus it has been commonly held that the Diaspora was the inevitable result of Jews being forced into exile, and not a deliberate missionary enterprise. Also, there is serious scepticism about any theory which attempts to account for the disappearance of a race like the Phœnicians by conjecturing that they were so akin to the Jews that fusion took place. But it is always well to have a hypothesis freshly stated, and this monograph is welcome and timely, if only for the new arrangement of data, based on a study of archæological evidence and historical probabilities.

The former thesis (pp. 22–68) endeavours to meet the theory that deportation accounts for the Diaspora, as well as the view, held by Renan and others, that the prolific birth-rate of the Jews and the inability of a small land like Palestine to hold the population led to emigration. Herr Rosen is thus obliged to work in his second thesis (pp. 5–21, 69 f.), for scholars, like Movers, have held that the Diaspora was largely due to the Phœnician slave-trade, which scattered Jews far and wide over the East. He admits this as one factor, but refuses to regard it as an adequate explanation of the Dispersion in general. According to him the Jewish race is not purely Jewish. He agrees here with Renan, who denied that there was any Jewish type of a specific racial character. But Rosen thinks that the variety of the types in Judaism goes back to a fusion of Phœnician and Jewish elements, and that the pre-Christian Dispersion with its varieties is only intelligible on the hypothesis that Phœnician (*i.e.* including Syrian, Arabic, and Canaanite) elements entered into the Jewish race.

So far as the former thesis is concerned, Herr Rosen's monograph offers a fairly convincing view of the data, though the fresh presentation barely establishes his conclusion in its entirety. As for the second thesis, it is possible but not proved—at any rate on the evidence adduced. After reading the monograph, one is more disposed to agree that the 'mission' motive in the Diaspora has to be recognized, though whether it is correct to argue that after the Hellenistic period Judaism was a religion of universalistic tendency rather than a people, is another point. And on the whole, it may be argued, the problem of the Philistines is too intricate to be solved on the lines laid down so lucidly and persuasively by Herr Rosen.

Among the fruitful discussions which are to be encountered in the pages of this stimulating work are those on the range and spirit of proselytism (pp. 64 f.), the Phœnicians at Elephantine (pp. 79 f.), and the evidence for Phœnicians in connexion with the Jewish group at Rome (pp. 95 f.). Professor Bertram, in his most valuable notes, suggests several points of critical interest. One is that instead of 'Judæa' in Ac 2^9 the Latin 'Judæi' offers the original reading; this is rejected by Professor Ropes in his recent text, but Professor Bertram maintains that it is the one satisfactory reading, when taken to mean not born Jews but members of the Jewish faith. The notes on Euhemerism (pp. 124, 128) and Is 19^{16-25} (pp. 131 f.) are excellent, as well as the remarks on the Septuagint (pp. 134, 137, 141, and 143). The brief discussion (p. 149) as to whether Judaism had any 'sacramental' elements should be compared with Dr. D. C. Simpson's observations in *Christianity in the Light of Modern Knowledge* (pp. 159 f.).

---

[1] *Juden und Phoenizier.* Das antike Judentum als Missionsreligion und die Entstehung der jüdischen Diaspora. Neu bearbeitet und erweitert von Friedrich Rosen und Georg Bertram (J. C. B. Mohr, Tübingen; 1929, M.11).

The monograph, therefore, lights up the Hellenistic and Oriental world between the third century B.C. and the third or fourth century A.D., challenging students to revise some of their hypotheses about the spread and spirit of Judaism in that syncretistic period. Even when its definite arguments are set aside, it furnishes the reader with plenty of data for a new insight into the intricate developments of race and religion during these centuries. Indirectly, of course, it bears upon the rise of Christianity also, for if Herr Rosen is correct the propaganda of the Christian faith must have been helped as well as anticipated by the Diaspora as a monotheistic enterprise undertaken for the inner mission of Judaism, *i.e.* of Judaism interpreted along the lines of the nobler prophets.

JAMES MOFFATT.

New York.

Jesus and History.

PROFESSOR H. PINARD DE LA BOULLAYE, S.J., the author of two large and learned volumes on Comparative Religion—'L'Étude comparée des religions'—has recently published a series of six addresses originally delivered at certain Conferences held in Paris in the spring of last year. The scope of the addresses is indicated by the title of the book, *Jésus et l'histoire* (Éditions Spes, Paris; 12 fr.). On a smaller scale the book attempts the task undertaken by Bishop Gore in his 'Belief in Jesus Christ.' The first address treats the babel of opposing opinions regarding Jesus Christ, and discusses their origin in current philosophical and historical methods and presuppositions. This study is followed by a competent survey of the opinions of the friends and enemies of Christianity, and of those who were indifferent to its claims, down to the death of Marcus Aurelius; and then by a discussion of the witness of the orthodox Church, its sacrifices, fidelity to tradition, and unanimity. Much the best chapter is the fourth, which examines the witness of Paul. The charges he had to face, we are reminded, did not turn on questions of orthodoxy: 'It is impossible to discover in his writings the least allusion, the least response to such accusations or the trace of such an opposition' (p. 138). The fifth address, on the value of the Gospels, is rather general in character, and suffers in consequence of the official Roman Catholic attitude to source-criticism. It contains, however, the very striking admission that, if the author were forced to choose between the Eucharist and the Gospels, he would choose the latter, since the Host is silent while the Gospels give us Jesus living and speaking. 'After two thousand years His heart still beats in these pages, like that of our parents and our departed friends in their letters to-day yellow with time' (p. 181). The last essay answers the objection that the original Christian tradition has been radically altered in the course of its transmission. This question has been much debated in France, as elsewhere, and the author effectively reverses several popular objections. The authentic tradition, he contends, was not transformed by the love of the first Christians; on the contrary, just because of their love, it was maintained with the greatest strictness (p. 214). Alike popular and scholarly in treatment, the book is a valuable study of present-day problems of faith. The reasoning is close, the illustrations felicitous, and the style frequently rises to heights of real eloquence.

VINCENT TAYLOR.

Aberdeen.

Contributions and Comments.

Manna.

THERE has always been among scientific workers a wide divergence of opinion as to the true nature and origin of the manna, which was for God's people, during their wilderness experiences, the bread of heaven which He gave them to eat. The most widely accepted suggestion as to its nature has been that it is sap of the *Tamarix*, and it is considered to be either a physiological secretion of the plant, or its sap flowing from the wounds caused by insects. That suggestion is now abandoned. Manna is a plant. It is one of the Lichens. Its scientific name is *Lecanora esculenta*, or the edible Lichen. It is greyish-yellow in colour and grows on grey limestone rocks, in the form of a wrinkled crust so like the rock itself that it is easily overlooked. Neither of these could be the manna of Exodus, which was a miraculous substance.

In order to solve this problem, the Hebrew University in Jerusalem organized in 1927 a small expedition to the Sinai Peninsula, and the leaders of that expedition, Dr. F. S. Bodenheimer and Dr. O. Theodor, have just published a very interesting account of their investigations, under the title *Ergebnisse der Sinai-Expedition, 1927, der Hebraischen Universität, Jerusalem.* Pp. 143+24 tafeln. (Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1929.)

The expedition visited some classical localities where manna was recorded. In the course of investigations, it was established beyond doubt that the appearance of manna is a phenomenon well known in other countries under the name of 'honey-dew,' which is a sweet excretion of plant-lice (*Aphidæ*) and scale-insects (*Coccidæ*). Two scale insects mainly responsible for the production of manna were found, namely, *Trabuteria mannipara*, Ehrenb., occurring in the lowlands, and *Najacoccus serpenterius* var. *minor*, Green, which replaces the former in the mountains. Two other Hemipterous insects, *Euscelis decoratus*, Haupt, and *Opsicus jucundus*, Leth., also produce manna, but to a lesser extent. All these insects live on *Tamarix nilotica* var. *mannifera*, Ehrenb.; no manna was observed on other species of *Tamarix*, a fact probably due to some physiological peculiarities of the former. The authors observed the actual excretion by the insects of drops of clear sweet fluid, and proved by experiments that the fluid is ingested by the insects from the vessels of the phloem. When in an experiment a twig bearing the insects was placed in water, the bark was cut below the insects, the production of manna continued in a normal manner, but it stopped as soon as the flow of carbohydrate solution from the leaves was interrupted by cutting off the bark above the insects. The dry desert climate of Sinai causes the syrup-like fluid excretion to crystallize, and the whitish grains thus produced, which cover the branches or fall to the ground underneath them, constitute the true manna of the Bible.

A chemical analysis of the manna demonstrated the presence of cane sugar, glucose, fruchose, and saccharose; pectines were also found, but there was no trace of proteins.

Detailed descriptions of the manna insects are given in the report, which includes very good photographs of various stages of the production of the manna. Notes on the course of the expedition and on the fauna of the Peninsula of Sinai in general provide very interesting reading on that still practically unexplored country.

Accepting the findings of these savants does not affect the miraculous character of the manna of the Israelites. As Dr. M'Laren maintained, 'It was miraculous in its origin—"rained from heaven,"—in its quantity, in its observance of times and seasons, in its putrefaction and preservation, as rotting when kept for greed, and remaining sweet when preserved for the Sabbath. It came straight from the creative will of God, and whether its name means "What is it?" or "It is a gift," the designation is equally true and appropriate, pointing, in the one case, to the mystery of its nature; in the other, to the love of the Giver, and in both referring it directly to the hand of God.' ARTHUR S. LANGLEY.

Wednesbury.

Entre Nous.

Adventurous Faith.

Dr. Hugh Black, formerly of Free St. George's, Edinburgh, and now for many years Professor of Practical Theology in Union Theological Seminary, New York, has contributed the last volume to Messrs. Hodder & Stoughton's 'People's Library' (2s. 6d. net). It is necessarily a small book but it is richly suggestive. Dr. Black reminds us that he is not a young man—his memory goes back earlier than most of the scientific discoveries of our age, to the time when Dr. Bell could not find any one courageous enough to advance him the necessary money to finance his early experiments in the use of the telephone—but his attitude is essentially modern. The title of his book is *The Adventure of being Man*, and the purpose of it is to suggest a way of looking at the mysterious universe and man's mysterious life from the point of view of adventure. He divides his subject into three—The Adventure, The Adventurer, and The Last Adventure.

What is the adventure? It is a certain attitude of the soul in which it makes a venture on the world and life, throwing itself on an unseen spiritual order. 'We believe that there is an end in purpose with which we can co-operate. We believe that what we experience of beauty and goodness and love are not illusions, and that human life is not the sport of chance. We embark on the great moral and spiritual adventure.

'When we do, we find everywhere the supporting facts. We find this faith the light of everything that lives in man, and that in the strength of it we can build up a human world. We look back into history and see that the spiritual forces have ever said the last word. We see ideas and ideals creating new and vital institutions, and heroic faiths saving the world. We find as a matter of experience that life does not play man false in his noblest hopes, that life hides no treachery against the soul. "This is the true joy in life," says Bernard Shaw in one of his most self-revealing moods, "the being used for a purpose recognized by yourself as a mighty one; the being thoroughly worn out before you are thrown on the scrap-heap; the being a force of nature, instead of a feverish, selfish little clod of ailments and grievances, complaining that the world will not devote itself to making you happy."'

It is forgotten sometimes that the other view of life implies faith also. Dr. Black says: 'The greatest men of faith I meet on this green earth are some who call themselves unbelievers. They have to accept such tremendous miracles, and assert such unproven assumptions'—'the universe is a series of accidents, and flukes, and peradventures, and haphazards, and coincidences. . . . One day there broke off from a flaming sun what ultimately by an amazing series of flukes became this earth. By another astounding series of accidents there gathered somehow on its surface some organic scum.'

And it is forgotten sometimes that the scientist is compelled to make assumptions and to take unproved things for granted before he begins his work. He must assume that the universe is rational; that it is causal not casual. But the fact that knowledge of any kind depends on faith goes deeper even than that. We must believe that the picture of reality that we get from our mental acts is a true one. The world we know is built up as a picture by percepts through the avenues of sense, and by concepts. It is a question here of *credo ut intelligam*. We must make a venture of faith.

Again, Dr. Black says everything human stands on this footing. 'The solid world of business, on which we all depend, looks the most material structure erected by man. When we ask our bankers and leaders of industry on what it rests, they reply that it is a system of credit—and credit, like creed, is *credo*, I believe. They will add that business needs public confidence—that is *fides*, faith. The most important development of modern business is the creation and management of what it calls "trusts." The demand which business men are always making on each other as colleagues is for loyalty and fidelity. Trust means confident reliance on integrity, or veracity, or some such quality. Every important business word has in it the word "faith" in Latin or English. So that this immense solid structure of business is so built that if a tenuous thing like credit be impaired, or an equally tenuous thing like public confidence be lost, the whole system would crash.'

The second part of the book deals with the adventurer—what man means. Surely those who cannot make up their minds about God can make them up about man. They cannot decide about another life, they may about this life. But here again it is a venture. Just as in the case of the venture of faith on the world, arguments can be brought on both sides. If it were not so, it would not be a venture. For on one side there are the facts that seem to show nothing in the world but the blind drive of non-moral force, and on the other side are the facts that prove that the world hides no treachery for the man who trusts it. So it is in the choice that we have to make as to what man is. We can point to the facts that link him to everything below him. For there are signs in plenty of his animal ancestry. On the other hand is the long story of the ascent of man. 'We are unworthy of our past heritage and our present privilege if we forget the great society of the noble living and the noble dead. This also is a fact, that every high thought and every splendid passion exemplified in others find instant response in our heart. We can say that this is man at his best, this is the true man, this is what he may be and should be, what he in nature is.'

There is a drastic sanity in true realism. But in the realm of art to-day a facsimile of morbid and unsavoury things often passes for it. Lately, Dr. Black says, a realist of that type wrote in commendation of the book of another, 'If there is a writer in America to-day who can lay hold of mean people and mean lives and tear their mean hearts out with more appalling realism, his work is unknown to me.' And, he adds, this was supposed to be such high praise that the publisher used it to advertise his wares. Conrad, who was certainly not a romanticist in dealing with life, says: 'What one feels so hopelessly barren in declared pessimism is just its arrogance. It seems as if the discovery made by many men at various times that there is so much evil in the world were a source of proud and unholy joy to some of the modern writers. . . . To be hopeful in an artistic sense it is not necessary to think that the world is good. It is enough to believe that there is no impossibility of its being made so.'

The one leader who deliberately staked everything on His faith in man was the Lord Jesus. And He fearlessly put His theory into practice. The heart of the objection to Him was that He acted His theory out and in that endangered the prestige of the whole social and religious system—'this man receiveth sinners and eateth with them.'

The third part of the book deals with the last adventure—'If a man die, shall he live again?'—and in it Dr. Black suggests the method of approach as part of the whole adventure of being man. But the reader must turn to the book itself for the development of this. All the ventures hang together.

The Noble Risk.

'Religion is not a formula of escape nor a way of safety. It is an adventure of the spirit. Clement of Alexandria, of the second century, who was of a cultivated pagan family, described his step from paganism into the Christian Church as taking "the noble risk of a desertion unto God." It needs only a little imagination to understand some of the pathos and heroism in the experience so modestly expressed. To break away from the safety and security of old ways, snapping tender ties of kinship and friendship, was "desertion" that meant pain and loss. Only the courage of a great faith, venturing from the known and the usual, could have induced him to take the noble risk.'[1]

Religious Thought of India.

The Student Christian Movement Press has just published a volume of selections from the religious literature of India with the title *Temple Bells*, edited by Mr. A. J. Appasamy, M.A., D.Phil. (5s. net). We are interested more than ever to-day in the mind of India. And the reading of this book certainly affords one avenue of approach. The publishers and the editor together have done all that they could to make it an attractive one to us. There are excellent introductory sketches of the authors of the poems, and delightful sepia illustrations from Indian pictures and sculpture. We give two selections. The first is by Rāmakṛishṇa Paramahaṁsa. Born of Brahman parents, he strove to conquer his pride of ancestry by doing the work of the street cleaner and scavenger. Anxious to know and understand other religions, he became later the disciple of a Muhammadan saint. His followers have quickened the religious impulses of the people of India, and they have done much social work.

The second quotation is from Rabindranath Tagore's volume of Bengali Poems—'Fruit Gathering.'

MOMENTS OF DEEP SILENCE.

Behold the bee buzzing and circling round and round near the blown lotus, how it buzzeth and circleth again and again:

But anon it goeth inside the flower, and then it settleth down and drinketh of the honey in silence:

Even so, disciple, man talketh and argueth before he hath found his joy in the Lord, before he hath tasted of faith:

But when he findeth the nectar at last in the opened lotus of his heart, at once he settleth down to drink it, and babbleth and talketh no more.[2]

THE BARE INFINITY OF GOD'S UNCROWDED PRESENCE.

Time after time I came to Your gate with raised hands, asking for more and yet more.

You gave and gave, now in slow measure, now in sudden excess.

I took some, and some things I let drop: some lay heavy on my hands: some I made into playthings and broke them when tired; till the wrecks and the hoard of Your gifts grew immense, hiding You, and the ceaseless expectation wore my heart out.

Take, oh take—has now become my cry.

Shatter all from this beggar's bowl: put out this lamp of the importunate watcher: hold my hands, raise me from the still-gathering heap of Your gifts into the bare infinity of Your uncrowded presence.[3]

---

[1] H. Black, *The Adventure of being Man*, 59.

[2] P. 69.

[3] P. 103.

Printed by MORRISON & GIBB LIMITED, Tanfield Works, and Published by T. & T. CLARK, 38 George Street, Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to THE EDITOR, Kings Gate, Aberdeen, Scotland.

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

Who is the best interpreter of the Old Testament? The Jew claims the book as his, the Christian claims it as his, and each thinks that he holds in his own hands the key to it. To the Jew the Old Testament is the Bible, the whole Bible; to the Christian the Bible includes the later Testament towards which he believes the older book points, and in which he believes it finds its consummation. Who is to be umpire in this honourable rivalry?

If any man could conceivably have the right to decide such a question, that man would perhaps be Mr. C. G. **Montefiore**. As a Jew, he understands the Old Testament thoroughly and from the inside, and he is conversant with the development within Judaism of Old Testament thought from the day when the Old Testament stood complete down to the present day. But more. He knows the New Testament; he is conversant with the development of Old Testament thought beyond and outside the domain of Judaism. Indeed, he knows the New Testament better than most Christians do. He has written on it not only with learning and insight, but with sympathy, and in such a way as to command not only the respect but the gratitude of Christian scholars.

But besides being a Jew, he has a mind of extraordinary fairness, and he exercises a discriminating judgment on that ancient literature which, taken as a whole, he passionately loves and which he has 'in divers portions and in divers manners' so brilliantly expounded. How frank and critical of it he can be appears in phrase after phrase of an article contributed by him to the April number of *The Holborn Review*. 'The Old Testament is to me,' he says, 'as it is to Christian critics, imperfect.' In recognizing the different levels of Hebrew religious achievement, he can speak of the *best* God of the Old Testament. 'The Old Testament,' he admits, 'has many faults'—in particular he specifies 'its cruelty, its revengefulness, its imprecations.' Here is an almost bolder concession: 'Much can be said against Yahweh; if you look for blemishes, you can find them in plenty. He is jealous, He is partial, He is often all *too* human, and even human where man is not at his best.'

Here is a fine blend of the lover and the critic—a critic who has not suffered his devotion to blind him to the imperfections of the thing he loves. What, then, has he to say on the momentous question of the contribution of Israel to religion? That is to be found in the article to which we have referred. It is the substance of an address on 'The Achievement of the Old Testament' which he delivered, as President, on the last day of last year at the meeting of the Society for Old Testament Study.

There are words, he admits, in the New Testament which cannot possibly thrill the Jew as they thrill the Christian. Such a word is, 'Come unto me, all ye that are weary and heavy laden.' But it is equally true, he believes, that there are words in the Old Testament which move the Jew as they cannot move the Christian. Among these words stands, first and foremost, this: 'Hear, O Israel, the Lord our God, the Lord is One. And thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thine heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy might.' And there are other words whose appeal, to the Jew, is only a little less moving. Such are, 'In that day shall the Lord be One and His name One'; or 'Ye are My witnesses'; or 'Ye shall be unto Me a kingdom of priests and a holy nation'; or 'Know therefore this day, and lay it to thine heart that the Lord He is God in heaven above and upon the earth beneath; there is none else.' This point may be readily conceded, that for good historical reasons such words are, as he puts it, 'more dear and precious and sacred to the Jew than to the Christian.'

The supreme achievement of the Old Testament, according to Mr. Montefiore, is that it contains all the essentials of religious Theism in a highly provocative form. Its God is as remote as could be from the realm of abstraction. The Old Testament has an almost overwhelming sense of the Personality of God. He is 'the God who rules and cares; the God who is just and pitiful and loving; the God to whom man can pray, and who enters into relations with man; the God who is creator; the God who rewards goodness and punishes wickedness; the God who helps and aids; the one and only God.'

It is much more difficult for the men of a later day, who are the heirs to centuries of metaphysical speculation, and who wrestle with the problems raised by ontology and ethics, to hold this conception of the Personality of God with the simplicity and conviction with which it is presented in the Old Testament. But it is just there that the Old Testament can render us an inestimable service. Written by men whose convictions sprang from their experience of life, it comes as a tonic to other men whose minds are jaded by philosophical discussion; and Mr. Montefiore's words will find an echo in many a heart when, uttering his own confession of faith, he says, 'Its very simplicity and fearlessness are a perpetual consolation, a constant stimulus, an abiding refreshment of soul.'

Another point he makes is that the Theism of the Old Testament is a virile and a human Theism. This is just another way of saying that the Personality of God is taken seriously. In one sense the God of the Old Testament is—if we may reverently say so—fashioned like a man, like a manly man, 'a mean between the two bad extremes of pitilessness and good-naturedness.' In another sense, of course, there is a great gulf fixed between God and man; and taking us into his confidence Mr. Montefiore tells us that, while he likes the Old Testament's insistence on the gulf between God and man, he likes hardly less the insistence on the bridge or bridges between them. Man can pray, God can hear; they are not inevitably and irrevocably apart. Man can say to God, '*Thou* art with *me*.' But the disciples of Barth and Otto will welcome the admission that 'the immensity of the difference between them is still more fundamental to Old Testament religion' than the kinship between them.

This is an illustration of the practical way in which the Old Testament, like life itself, reconciles theoretically unreconciled antinomies. Part of its charm lies in the generosity which finds a place for opposites, and which has no interest in forcing its truth into any Procrustean bed. Its God is both near and far; He is loving, but He is also just. Both types of statement are felt to be true, and the Old Testament allows them to lie quietly side by side; it feels under no obligation to attempt any theoretical reconciliation between them. This power of doing justice to seeming opposites appears in its recognition alike of man's free will and of his need of Divine grace. Here Mr. Montefiore has some suggestive things to say.

He quotes with approval the words of Rousseau's Savoyard Vicar: 'If I do evil, I have no excuse; I do it because I will to do it; to ask him (*i.e.* God) to change my will is to ask him what he asks from me; it is to ask him that he should do my work, and that I may receive the reward.' But he quotes with equal approval the words of a Jewish friend of his who said, 'In myself I am utterly rotten and feeble. Whatever goodness I may have done has been all the work of God.' Both these statements have their counterpart in the Old Testament. On the one hand it says, 'thou shalt' and 'thou shalt not,' and to its 'ought,' Mr. MONTEFIORE tells us he replies, not, 'I can't,' but 'I can': he feels ashamed when he has done wrong, just because he knows he could have done right, and his extenuations and explanations of sin are 'all stuff and nonsense.' On the other hand it says, 'Create in me a clean heart, O God,' and 'Teach me to do thy will.' Man is both able and unable; and 'if you like,' as the lecturer pleasantly says, 'to call the one a Jewish and Old Testament bit of reality, and the other a New Testament and Christian bit of reality, I am content, so long as it is conceded to me that both bits are valuable, and that neither bit is wholly false or expresses the full truth, the *complete* reality.'

These things, however, great as they are, do not exhaust the achievement of the Old Testament. Though Mr. MONTEFIORE's spiritual affinities are decidedly with the prophet rather than the priest, he has an intense and reverent appreciation of the Law, that is, 'the Law as a whole'; to him it is the symbol of Law, and behind it is the majesty of God Himself. Like every good Jew he regards the Sabbath as vastly more than a 'grand social achievement, put under the ægis of religion'; it fills him with unspeakable joy, such as those who are alien to the commonwealth of Israel can only remotely understand.

But next to its vivid Theism, perhaps the supreme achievement of the Old Testament is its 'indissoluble intertwining of religion with morality.' Not only in the Prophets but in the Psalter and the Proverbs what God demands are justice, kindness, and humility. So intensely ethical is the Old Testament's conception that, as Mr. MONTEFIORE bluntly says, 'If we subtract God's moral qualities from Him, He simply collapses.' The God whom it invites us to worship is a God with a character, as Sir George Adam Smith used to say.

Surely, then, a book which enshrines a religion so vital to human welfare as this address shows the Old Testament to be deserves from the religious public a respect and attention which in these days it all too seldom receives.

The more one reads the contributions made by Dr. N. P. WILLIAMS, the Lady Margaret Professor of Divinity at Oxford, to theological literature, the more one realizes that in him the Anglican Church possesses a scholar and thinker of eminent quality. In a book just published, *The Grace of God* (Longmans; 4s. net), he deals with some of the profoundest subjects of human thought. The essay is partly Biblical, partly historical, and (in its closing chapter) constructive and suggestive. The history of reflection on the relations of the Divine and the Human in salvation is pursued through the centuries, and we are shown the swing of minds between the conception of Grace as Power on the one hand, and what may be called Influence on the other. The one is Augustinian, and is characteristic of the 'twice-born,' the men of sudden conversion, leading to a stiff predestinarian creed. The other is Pelagian, characteristic of the 'once-born,' the moralists who refuse any faith in 'irresistible' grace. For this review the reader is referred to the book. We are at present concerned with the chapters on the New Testament and on the author's own construction.

The primary significance of grace in Greek is 'beauty,' 'charm,' 'attractiveness,' and from this comes the secondary sense of 'kindness,' 'good will,' or 'graciousness,' that is, of the mental or emotional quality lying behind an attractive appearance. In the Septuagint χάρις carries the same double significance, and thus the idea was already rough-hewn for its future position as the foundation stone of the Christian 'doctrine of grace' before the Apostle of the Gentiles began the work of chiselling it into exact lines and contours. The basic meaning, therefore, of the term 'grace,' which St. Paul found in existence, is that of God's favour or kindliness towards man, or certain men.

But this 'favour' is not conceived merely as an abstract quality or state of His Being: it is a quality manifested in operation, of a twofold kind; there is, first, the pre-mundane act whereby He foreknows certain individuals and fore-ordains them to membership of the Church, so that the small body of Christian Jews can be described as a 'remnant constituted by an act of selection based on "grace"'; and there is, secondly, the temporal act of 'calling' and 'justifying' (or pardoning) the individual so foreknown, which, though *ex parte hominis* to be considered as contingent upon the individual's 'faith,' *ex parte Dei* is so spontaneous an ebullition of omnipotent and sovereign power that all Christians must think of themselves as 'acquitted freely, undeservedly, [solely] by an exercise of His royal grace.'

'Grace,' in Pauline thought, is thus primarily the grace of election and justification, rather than of sanctification. It has to do with the beginnings of the Christian life, its ideal beginning in God's pre-mundane counsels and its concrete beginning in time, rather than with its continuance and progress. The concept which the word connotes is regal, governmental, and judicial in character: it presupposes a way of thinking about God which regards Him as acting upon men, and shaping their destinies from without. The 'twice-born' element in St. Paul's temperament, which made his own instantaneous conversion appear to him simply as a catastrophic irruption of the Divine Will into his life, neither caused nor even prepared for by his pre-conversion training or experiences (Gal 1^{14}), leads him to insist again and again upon the completely unmerited and gratuitous character of the Divine favour, and to inveigh against the idea that it can be earned by 'works,' or human effort of any kind.

What is true of the 'grace' which makes men members of the redeemed community is true equally of the narrower and more specialized 'grace' which appoints individuals to particular functions in the community—apostleship, or the office of prophet or teacher—or assigns specific *charismata* to them (Ro 12^{6}): all 'grace,' whether general or particular in its bearing, represents the spontaneous self-caused kindness of God towards His chosen, a kindness which no efforts of theirs could have evoked if He had not willed to feel it. Obviously the tendency of this line of thought is to exhibit the idea of the grace of election and justification as set in a context of adamantine predestinarianism. And the idea of 'grace' inevitably generates the correlative idea of reprobation, the 'vessels of mercy' standing out in clear distinction from the 'vessels of wrath,' but both alike being moulded by the Almighty Potter out of the same common clay of human kind (Ro 9^{19-24}).

This conception of the grace of election and justification, which tends to represent God as moving His human creatures from without, like pawns on a chess-board, stands quite apart from the thought of God's subtle operations within the soul, penetrating, healing, and building up, to which the name of 'sanctifying grace' has been given by later theology. It must not be supposed, however, that this is absent from St. Paul; on the contrary, he affirms emphatically that the essence of the gospel is Divine power, sweeping on to the goal of salvation every one that believeth. But the Pauline name for this supernatural energy or power is *pneuma*, 'spirit,' and not 'grace.'

It might seem as though this omnipotent influence which penetrates the citadel of the soul was as little to be reconciled with human freedom as a sovereign Divine will compelling from without. But St. Paul refuses to admit this. In his thought, the viewless tides of 'Spirit,' or of 'the Spirit,' insensibly flood the springs of human volition in such a way that the Spirit-possessed individual does what is right because he spontaneously desires to do what is right, not because of any external sanction or coercion; the virtues which are the 'fruit of the Spirit' are also the products of his own self-determining effort. The contrasts of 'Law' and 'grace,' and of 'letter' and 'spirit' are just the contrast between the Old

Dispensation and the New, and, taken together, contain the potentiality of a unification of the ideas of 'grace' and 'spirit'; for the possession of 'spirit' is the corollary and the sure proof of the enjoyment of 'grace.'

This hint is followed up by Dr. Williams in his concluding chapter, in which he asks whether it is not possible to effect a synthesis between the two extremes exhibited in the history of human reflection on grace and freedom. He thinks the mistake of the past has been in approaching the problem from above. A more hopeful way is to regard it as belonging to the sphere of psychology, and to study the experiences and not the metaphysics of the saints. There are two great types of religious experience, that of the 'twice-born' and that of the 'once-born.' Can we strike the balance between them? Briefly, the answer is found by identifying grace with the Holy Spirit. Grace is not an impersonal something, but the influence of a Person on a person. It is 'God's presence and His very Self, and Essence all Divine.'

Dr. Williams adopts the suggestion (made years ago by Dr. Sanday and received at the time unsympathetically) that the subconscious region is the part most accessible to the Divine influence. He takes as a parallel the work of the psychotherapist, who communicates, both by suggestion and personal influence, the healing power the patient needs. Similarly, God penetrates the subconscious selves of His people through the power of His Spirit, and assists, without impairing, their free will, by a 'grace' which is real without being strictly irresistible. In this way we are able to recover the Pauline point of view concerning *pneuma* without jettisoning the familiar terminology of 'grace' consecrated by the usage of seventeen centuries.

'The haunting problem of miracles,' as Dr. Sanday called it, is always with us. A discussion of it brings us into contact with many of the most important problems in philosophy and theology, such as the personality of God, Divine providence, the Person of Christ, the historicity of the Gospels, and the whole question of revelation. To quote Dr. Sanday again, 'This is the one crucial question which brings to a head, and includes all the rest.' We therefore give a cordial welcome to a very excellent book on the subject, *Miracle in History and in Modern Thought*, by the Rev. C. J. Wright, B.D. (Constable; 18s. net), which is fitted to exercise a powerful and wholesome influence on Christian thought. It is a fine product of wide reading and clear thinking, in which the whole contentious problem of miracle is reviewed in the light of modern historical, scientific, psychological, and philosophical investigation.

Our age has witnessed a marked change of view in regard to miracles. Instead of being gloried in, as in the Apostolic Church, they are apologized for and explained away. Instead of being offered as among the chief of Christian evidences, they are felt to be an encumbrance, and an endeavour is made to prove that they may be given up without detriment to the Christian faith. Harnack says: 'The question of miracles is of relative indifference . . . the question on which everything turns is whether we are helplessly yoked to an inexorable necessity, or whether a God exists who rules and governs and whose power to compel Nature we can move by prayer and make a part of our experience.' To this the traditionalist school would reply that miracles have vital importance as the chief evidence of a God who really governs. Evidently the two sides have a different conception of miracle and of the mode of God's government.

'Deep is the significance of miracles,' says Carlyle; 'meantime the question of questions is, What specially is a miracle?' To this question the most diverse and confusing answers have been given. Miracles have been defined as violations or suspensions of natural law, as events happening without physical antecedents or by direct Divine power. On the other hand there are those, like Lord Kelvin and the Earl of Balfour, who give the term 'miraculous' to any and every normal intervention of mind in material nature. While this confusion of terms continues, it is useless to attempt to carry forward the argument. We must agree as to what we mean by Nature and the supernatural, by law and the violation of law. In short, we must go to the root of the matter and clarify our ideas of God in His relation to the world.

But first let us consider what history and science have to say. The question which history has to answer is simply, 'What has happened in the past?' It is not whether *miracles* have happened, but whether the *events* recorded have happened. Whether any event should be designated a miracle is a question outside the scope of history. '*Event*, not *interpretative idea of event*, is the domain of historical science.' It is quite illegitimate to argue, as Hume does, that certain events cannot possibly have happened because they are designated miracles. Whether an event really happened is a totally different question from any interpretation put upon it. Similarly the question for natural science is simply, 'What are the facts?' and all the facts must be treated without bias. It is not permissible to begin by ruling out the possibility of certain facts because they are labelled as supernatural.

'It can hardly be doubted that the present condition of uncertainty in regard to miracle has been chiefly brought about by the progress of natural science,' and it has been said that science cannot admit miracle. This is really to be understood as the scientist's declaration of faith in the rationality of Nature, together with his confession that the ultimate explanation of phenomena lies beyond the realm of science. On the one hand, 'science rightly makes the postulate that there are no miracles—which is no more than saying that science goes at her task in a courageous spirit, and with a sense of responsibility. She means to puzzle over every problem to the very end, instead of giving up weakly at the first difficulty and saying, This is doubtless a miracle and hence insoluble.' On the other hand, 'whatever notion the term "miracle" carries with it, at any rate, it *does* carry that of an ultimate interpretation. Since that is so, science can never say of any event or fact that it is miraculous. To say that would be for her to go beyond her province and enter the domain of ultimate considerations, where religion and philosophy have their home.'

The question of miracle is essentially a religious question whose solution brings into view the whole field of God's relation to the world. If the question be asked, 'What is the truth latent in the idea of miracle? the answer is that it stands for the belief in a God who reveals Himself in us and to us, a God who is immanent in us and transcendent over us. It stands for the denial that the universe of scientific phenomena is the ground of itself, maintaining that behind event there are thought and will and love, with which man in his religious experience may have direct knowledge.' Too often has God been conceived as almost exclusively transcendent, dwelling in the realm of the supernatural, and only on rare occasions giving special evidence of His power by breaking in upon the orderly realm of Nature. This conception is not only unchristian but profoundly irreligious, inasmuch as it practically in effect excludes God from the world of Nature, or at least regards His working there as in some sense less Divine.

'The truth is that Nature's ways are God's ways; that, in other words, the natural is the supernatural mode of working. When God acts He does not "interfere" with a Nature external to Himself. We may only speak of His "interference" (ambiguous word) if He is "interfering" all the time. What we call Nature is a manifestation of His activities. Immanence stands for the refusal to "grudge God His own universe"—a view which, as Romanes so well said, is involved in the belief "that there must be something inexplicable or miraculous about a phenomenon in order to its being divine."' Yet there is a danger of passing from one extreme to the opposite. Divine transcendence must still be firmly held. The distinction between the natural and the supernatural cannot be given up. Otherwise 'we have left for ourselves no term to conserve the truth of the noumenal ground and cause of this Nature. If God be regarded as "just a synonym for Nature," then theism has gone, deism likewise, and the sacred word *God* must be banished to the limbo of discredited anthropomorphisms.'

The discussion of miracle, however, is never conducted *in vacuo*. It is the gospel miracles that keep it a living and a burning question. In regard to these, historical criticism must have perfectly free scope to inquire what in each case actually happened; a sane science will warn us not prematurely to close the question of what is possible in such a mysterious world as this; modern physics has new and strange things to tell us of the potencies of matter, and of its secret kinship with spirit; while psychical science reveals a world of unexplored possibilities in human personality. Beyond these studies and considerations there are the religious questions. 'Christianity's supreme assertion always has been, and always must be, that the personal God has acted, has manifested Himself in a more essential way than before or since, in the person of Christ. . . . What is written in our hearts is proclaimed in time by Him who came out of eternity to reveal to us the Father. The "miracle" of His acts is not that they were interpositions of omnipotent power, but that they were manifestations of omnipotent love. It is because most of them are such that we cannot regard them as "stumbling-blocks" to be extirpated wholesale from the Gospels. While the attitude of those, who regard miracles as "proofs" of the truth as it is in Jesus, is to be, and must be, increasingly repudiated, so also is that of those who regard the gospel "miracles" as obstacles to the recognition of that truth. These latter seem to feel with Rousseau that if we could only get rid of the "miracles" the whole world would fall at the feet of Jesus. If we regard the Gospels more closely, however, we shall see that most of these "miracles" are not "stumbling-blocks" that keep men from Him, but steps that lead men to Him.'

Adolf von Harnack.

By Professor the Rev. G. D. Henderson, B.D., University of Aberdeen.

I remember Dr. Spiecker describing to some of us a visit which, during the short peace mission to the Churches of England at the beginning of 1911, he had paid to Westminster Abbey, in company with Harnack. The visit proved by no means the cursory and formal inspection for which the authorities were prepared, for Harnack manifested intense interest in those documents of stone, was very particular in his inquiries, and insisted upon discussing numerous points with his guides.

This seems a typical revelation of the man, always intent, quick to observe, marvellously informed, and after all the study which had brought him to a position of supremacy in his own department still not only willing but profoundly eager to learn.

Never was any one more alert than Harnack. He moved rapidly and spoke quickly and fluently, sputtering somewhat at times from excitement, always very much awake and alive. Even his spectacles and his shock of upright hair contributed to the general impression of alertness.

He combined to an extent rarely achieved the qualities of a scholar and of a teacher. In Germany more than anywhere one comes across learned men who have almost specialized away their personality. On the other hand, one knows of most effective teachers who have left no printed contribution to their subject. Harnack, however, was as great as any one of our time in both particulars, and it is doubtless for this reason that his name is so familiar to all who have any interest in either Church or University.

As a lecturer I have not known his equal. Von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff had a delightful geniality and an enticing voice which rendered him more popular. Rudolf Eucken had an impassioned eloquence which made him singularly attractive to the general public. But for effective teaching Harnack would be difficult to match.

He was a clear and ready speaker, never much hampered by his notes, and using intelligible German—as he also did when he wrote. His command of material enabled him to produce interesting illustrations of his points, and to make pertinent applications of lessons of early times to modern conditions. He had a power of vivid description and dramatic narration, with an occasional glow of passion, so that he could make the march of events very real. His insight into character led him to give most skilful portrayals of men such as Athanasius, and he made one feel that history was about human beings in a way that books do not often succeed in suggesting, the men in the New Testament and in the Church Councils being very like their modern successors, and acting from such motives as inspire ordinary people to-day. Then there was his almost 'pawky' humour. He enjoyed his lectures and made his listeners enjoy them, especially with the assistance of illuminating asides. One admired his freedom from bitterness in discussing opponents, his obvious broad-mindedness, his true moral earnestness. Thus he easily won the confidence of his students, and gained for his views not merely the submission of minds convinced, but the heartfelt allegiance of eager captives.

His was a great personality. In him German scholarship and theology and religion had a servant who was a man of genius and standing, who could have been a master wherever he might have turned. The interesting catalogue which the *Harnack-Ehrung* of 1921 gives us of the theological leaders of American and Continental Christendom who called him master is a unique testimony to teaching powers far above the common, and had we the list of British students who have heard his lectures, from the days when Sir George Adam Smith and one or two more first 'discovered' him at Leipzig, until the gloomy years of the Great War turned our young divines somewhat vaguely to France and America for guidance, what a record of influence it would make!

As for his scholarship production, from the time as far back as 1876, when he first commanded attention by his work on the Apostolic Fathers, until he published last year's treatise on *I. Clemensbrief*, there has been a steady output of definite additions to historical and theological learning. No one has ever been so completely master of the first three centuries; but it was not merely with regard to them that Harnack could speak with judgment and, indeed, with authority. From his pen we have not only acute and suggestive discussions of New Testament problems, great and small, monumental and exact works of patristic research, investigations into the details of life in the early Church, strikingly original studies of Marcion, and essays in ecclesiastical polity, but we have illuminating treatment of Augustine, fresh utterances on Luther and Romanism and Reformation subjects, volumes of addresses on social questions and the practical issues of War-time, even biographical sketches, while one must not overlook his extensive editorial responsibility, such as that on the *Theologische Literaturzeitung*. No doubt he was weaker when he dealt with subjects such as the Roman Church, and he certainly allows Lutheranism almost to occupy on his horizon the place which Hegel gave to the Prussian State; but everything he has written has called for attention.

Best known amongst his works are his exact and laborious *Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur bis Eusebius*, his fascinating *Mission und Ausbreitung des Christentums in den ersten drei Jahrhunderten*, his epoch-making *Dogmengeschichte*, and his much discussed *Wesen des Christentums*. What a record of production, especially when we realize that he combined accurate and patient historical inquiry with brilliant theological leadership!

Adolf Harnack was born of an academic family in 1851, and taught at Leipzig, Giessen, and Marburg before attaining (not without conservative opposition) the post in Berlin with which his name will long be associated. He was speedily outstanding amongst the liberal theologians, and drew large classes of students. He came also to exercise important influence through his connexion with the library in Berlin, of which he was head, and various learned societies in which he took an interest, the Prussian Academy (of which he wrote an elaborate history), the Kaiser Wilhelm Society (of which as President, he is said by Von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff to have sported a specially devised uniform which was compared with the plumage of a canary!). He showed practical concern for education, but took no part in the Church courts. He won the respect and friendship of Wilhelm II., who ultimately ennobled him. He took an unhesitating stand for his country when the Great War began, and every one knows of his uncompromising retort to British scholars which is published in his *Aus der Friedens- und Kriegsarbeit*. It was a calamity to the advance of knowledge that such a breach was possible. Harnack's contribution to his subject, however, had been made before this date and was already the property of the educated world. Even in his own country his message had been given, and younger scholars were inclined to take him for granted and pass on, though one must qualify this in turn by remarking on the high quality of some of his most recent pieces of exegesis, which students will not dare to ignore. Some ten years ago he retired from his more strenuous

University work, but he did not abandon either study or lecturing, and he was still serving the cause of Truth, when, after a short illness, his long and active life came unexpectedly to a close at Heidelberg on June 10.

In his days of less maturity his ardent spirit of investigation naturally led him to expressions of opinion which alarmed the pious orthodox. Latterly his ideas were, quite as naturally, in some degree mellowed; but he did not change his point of view, and perhaps he has done as much as any one to win the confidence of the modern Protestant Churches for liberal thought, and to convince them that the true understanding and practice of the Christian Faith will come only through courageous thinking and the consecrated use of patient learning. He is a splendid justification for the method of allowing scholars to seek truth freely, untrammelled by the tests which have contributed so largely to render Scottish Calvinism hopelessly unproductive.

Harnack was always more advanced than the generality of his fellow-Ritschlians. At the same time he was never a mere assailant of orthodoxy, but definitely a seeker after truth, and in this search he not infrequently appears in support of traditional views. Thus, while the Resurrection evidence did not satisfy him, he has been one of the most effective advocates of the healing miracles. When his *Lukas der Arzt, der Verfasser des dritten Evangeliums und der Apostelgeschichte* appeared, Professor Nicol could write with astonishment of 'Harnack among the Apologists.' And he was always willing to modify his opinions as new evidence presented itself to him.

Not every deduction and guess which Harnack made will live. I don't suppose many people seriously attribute *Hebrews* to Priscilla. Others of his conclusions will remain for long matter of divided opinion amongst scholars. Some will continue to prefer Schürer or Foakes-Jackson in their estimate of Luke, or possibly Swete on the pre-existence of Christ. But even where he has been carried away in the excitement of brilliant discoveries and has mistaken the part for the whole, he has done much to rouse the Church to consciousness of significant matters previously ignored or misconstrued. His very over-emphasis of Hellenistic influences may be placed in this category.

It must, however, be emphasized that the greater part of what he has done has a validity that is not affected by his special point of view. He may be most widely known as the advocate of these special views. Popularly he is no doubt the author of *What is Christianity?* But of greater service to the Church are accumulations of documentary evidence in so many of his books, and works such as his *Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur,* which never find their way into ordinary libraries.

It was in connexion with the History of Doctrine that Harnack's special theories emerged. This is a science which, as Baur admits, began in Aberdeen with the work of John Forbes of Corse. Since then it has been almost entirely German, and owes most to Baur, who saw everything in the light of Hegel and made experience progressively elucidate revelation, and to Harnack, who takes an entirely different view. He watches the original complete historical revelation being variously interpreted and misinterpreted, twisted and disguised and managed, each generation finding what it thinks it needs, but none being really saved except in so far as it goes back to the true Person of Christ manifested in the Synoptic Gospels.

As a good Ritschlian, Harnack centres all upon the historical Jesus, assigning ecclesiastical dogma a subordinate place, as accretion and non-essential, though scarcely justifying Pfleiderer's criticism that he regards the history of doctrine as a progressive obscuring of Christian truth.

Harnack attempts to distinguish the essential from the non-essential in the series of transformations, and it is the explanation of his guiding beliefs on this which he offered in his *Wesen des Christentums.* By his theory, however, he has given up all real claim to state what is normative in Christianity. He can only say what appeals to him. Loisy puts his finger on this fatal weakness, and simply rejects Harnack's essential core. Harnack also assumes that only a movement's historical origins exhibit its genuine nature, which is not a doctrine which bears examination. His simplification of Christianity is too simple. It is hopeless to expect every one to find the same Jesus even in the Synoptic Gospels. He himself states what he holds to be the leading features of Jesus' message as, the Kingdom of God and its coming, God the Father and the infinite value of the human soul, and the higher righteousness and the commandment of love. This, however, is to select rather than to analyse. It lays great stress on the ethical and it ignores Apocalyptic. It declares practically every characteristic type of our religion—for example, mysticism—to be un-Christian. Harnack was so unsympathetic to the mediæval that it is curious he did not observe how mediæval it is to seek the essence of anything by abstraction.

The ideas in the *Wesen des Christentums* are admirably expressed, and the book was extremely popular; but one cannot suppose that it completely satisfies any one to-day, especially since Troeltsch has shown so much more philosophical acumen in his investigation of just such problems. Troeltsch has certainly brought us a step beyond Harnack.

Similarly, however, in his day Harnack provided the much-needed corrective to the evolutionary optimistic view of history which had so long been dominant under the influence of Hegel, and of which we still sometimes meet the ghost, since Herbert Spencer and Karl Marx have encouraged it, and it suits the teleological conceptions of many Christians. It is nevertheless too easy, as the Ritschlian in Harnack perceived. Progress is a much more irrational business than we are apt to think when we reason backwards through time. One does not go far in history with the help of mere logic. Things do sometimes go wrong; and it is scarcely fair to bow to the victor so abjectly as is customary.

It was because he realized the inadequacy of such ideas of uncoiling perfection that Harnack so dearly loved a good heretic, such as Marcion or Theodore of Mopsuestia. At times he would have liked his heretic to kill the dragon and win the princess. Certainly his heretics always had a real chance, and not as with Baur a merely formal share in the inevitable movement, appearing so as to be ignominiously knocked on the head. Since Harnack, no one can doubt the vital importance of the contribution which the heretics have made to Christian thought.

It was Harnack, further, who so clearly recognized that the theological and ecclesiastical do not form a world apart. This seems fairly obvious to us, but it required to be said, for it was not recognized by such forerunners in the sphere of History of Doctrine as Neander. Developments in those departments are dependent upon the general conditions of life. Personalities, economics, politics, all exercise definite influence upon them. The whole environment of the Christian is acting upon his religious consciousness. Doubtless Harnack went too far in suggesting that these influences of the times so often caused 'total perversion' of Christianity.

His *Dogmengeschichte* is governed by this presupposition. First, Greek philosophical and cultural influences, then Roman imperial, then Augustinian theological, then mediæval pagan obscured the Galilean gospel, and to release Christianity from such Babylonian captivity was the achievement of Luther. This is the process he traces in Church History.

Harnack's chief antipathy was naturally to Greek metaphysical theology. Here was the greatest of the perversions. Dogma he regarded as the work of the Greeks, and an unfortunate work at that. No one dreams of denying the tremendous part played by Greece in the development of what we know as Christianity. Most people rejoice that its marvellous legacy of thought and culture was not lost to the Church, and this however much they dislike Dogma. It is also clear that apart from this acceptance of Greece by Christianity there would have been no acceptance of Christianity by Greece. Christianity would have died in Palestine. Harnack is quite right that beyond the language there is practically nothing Greek about the Synoptics; and yet to make so much of this as he does, and to point out that early Christian literature 'apart from Paul, Luke, and John' shows little sign of Greek influence, is to call our religion a changeling from its earliest infancy. One fancies also that Gnosticism bulks somewhat too prominently in Harnack's Greece.

His main point, however, is justified, for what he attacks is the placing of theology and much else before religion. Christianity to him is not a set of opinions, but a life; and any one who considers the Scottish mania for Covenants and Confessions and Catechisms, and the remoteness of most of our preaching until very recent times from the practical concerns of common people will recognize how valuable his protest and reminder must have been. It is only a pity that such a work of genius as the *Dogmengeschichte* should have even so valuable teaching as its bias and standpoint; but not even Ranke could see without his eyes, and it is something to feel the personality of Harnack throughout his work, for this antipathy to the metaphysical is 'essential' Harnack.

He had been in trouble about his attitude to intellectual expressions of the Faith quite early in his career. It was when he took occasion to protest against the use of the Apostles' Creed as a test for ordination. There was a serious dispute, and he published his views in his *Apostolische Glaubensbekenntnis,* which passed through many editions. The Creed represented to him Greek theology and not the Synoptic message. He wished a simpler formula, embodying what he regarded as the fundamentals. His selection was subjective, though he did not think so, believing it entirely a matter of historic facts, and forgetting to what extent 'facts' are mind-produced. He would have been more historical had he recognized that this must always be the case, and had he simply pressed for the abandonment of the theological test. But his guiding thought was just what inspired his *Dogmengeschichte* and his *Wesen des Christentums*. It was his intense belief in the truth and beauty and glory of the Christianity of Jesus, and his feeling that that is what we need to live to-day, and that all else is accretion.

By Harnack's death a career of great distinction and usefulness and a life that was full and rich came to an end, and the loss to the Christian Church is not small. A man of high intellectual gifts, broad interests, wide experience, and tireless activity, a courageous leader of religious thought, a respected public figure, he has by his researches made the Church stronger and wiser than he found it. When a cause is genuine there is no apologetic like thorough investigation, and from this point of view Adolf von Harnack must be acclaimed a true defender of the Faith.

The Mind of Christ on Moral Problems of To-day.

VII.

Temperance.

By J. L. Paton, Esq., M.A., President of Memorial University College,
St. John's, Newfoundland.

One by one the claims of Alcohol to a place in human life are disappearing. Men used to think it was a food; medical science says it is a drug and dangerous at that. Men thought it necessary to health and physical fitness, and now athletes will have none of it; doctors tell us it diminishes our power of resistance to infection and slows the process of convalescence. It was claimed that it was a help to the endurance of fatigue and cold; but arctic explorers and mountain climbers and other pioneers fight shy of it. It was claimed that with alcohol a man could do his work better, but directly the claim was submitted to objective tests it was proved that, whatever the worker himself felt about it, the work done under its influence was less in quantity and inferior in quality. Not long ago alcohol was credited with therapeutic value, but its use in hospitals has reached almost a vanishing point. It was the theory of Dickens and his contemporaries that there could be no social jollity without it, but our large Holiday Associations and Travel Clubs have cut it out, and even in Germany the great Youth Movement has discarded it as part of the musty tradition of the past.

If these things are not known, it is due to ignorance, though such ignorance is found among highly educated people. Their ignorance is certainly not due to the withholding of knowledge.

Now the great obstacle to the progress of temperance is the new vivid sense of personal liberty which is characteristic of our day. To woman and to youth there has come a new emancipation. Now as never before they have the ordering of their lives in their own hand, and like the newly emancipated slaves of 1865 they have not yet adjusted themselves to the new conditions. 'May I not do as I like? If I sign this pledge of abstinence, am I not putting myself once more under restraint? If alcohol increases the pleasures of life, why should I forgo it? Is it not an unnecessary curtailment? Besides, if I vote for this local option, am I not putting under compulsion a whole company of other men and women who do not see as I do? Am I not imposing my own personal taste upon them? And, in any case, does it not betoken a stronger will-power and superior self-control to use alcohol than to swear off?'

The answer is simple. It is twofold.

First, for every man to do as he likes is anarchy. Liberty is not anarchy. If each individual motorist drove as he liked, as fast as he chose, either on the right hand or on the left, not caring for any signals or any one else's safety, his own safety would soon be at an end. A man's liberty is not a personal thing; it is civic, that is to say, it is conditioned all the time by his social environment. His liberty must not interfere with the liberty of other people, nor be inconsistent with the health and general well-being of the whole of which he forms a part. A person is a mere infinitesimal fraction of a whole integer. Apart from the integer, he has no existence unless he lives like Robinson Crusoe in inglorious solitude, whether as θεός or θήριον. It is true, indeed, that Christ insists on the infinite value of each human soul. His sacrifice was for the sin of the individual and the salvation of the individual, as well as for the sin and salvation of the whole world. But no man liveth unto himself or dieth unto himself. If he perishes, he drags others down with him. If he is saved, he is saved into a society which we call the Church.

Secondly, a man finds his liberty not in his own will but in God's. When he is saved he gives up his own will and identifies himself with the will of God. His body becomes 'the instrument of Deity.' He takes upon him a yoke, he becomes a fellow-worker with God. This is the paradox of Christianity. St. Paul is the 'bond slave' of the Saviour who set him free. In that bond-service he finds perfect freedom. Freedom is never aimless, it must have an end in view, it is not an end in itself. Unconfined steam vanishes into nothingness. Steam which is under control serves the ends of man. The cry for freedom for freedom's sake takes us nowhere. Freedom is simply a man's power to fulfil his impulses. Man's impulses are of two kinds, higher and lower. The lower impulses he shares with the lower creation. So long as he prefers them he is not distinctively man. Man, like everything else, has to be defined by his differentia—not by what he has in common with the brutes, but by what makes him superior to them. He has no right to any freedom save that which fulfils the higher law of his manhood. And that higher law of his being he can fulfil only in common with his fellow-humans. The higher his aims, the more the principle of sharing comes into the fulfilling of them. The Kingdom of Heaven is the fellowship of men and women, whose law of life is love, in whom God lives as Father, Jesus as Lord, and in which all men are brothers through communion in the Spirit.

The question then is—What is the position of alcohol in a society of human beings which is deliberately shaping its common life towards this end, in the Spirit of this Kingdom of God? Setting this aim before them, how will the fellow-men of Christ act as citizens of the State? Clearly they will use their power as citizens, their vote, their personal influence and energy, to securing whatever conduces to this end. Every political proposal will be judged by this test; does it conduce or does it not conduce to the Kingdom of God?

In this matter of alcoholic liquor, a man's first impulse may be to say, 'This matter is personal to myself. The effect may be as medical science tells me, a certain lowering of my higher faculties, but I must risk that. I think it is worth while. I have worries which I am anxious to put away from me. Alcohol helps me to forget them. Give me the *obliviosum Massicum*, as Horace called it.'

The answer to this argument is threefold. In order that you may gratify this desire which you reckon harmless, you must consider that the same facilities which are provided for you to obtain alcohol must be open to every other citizen in the same degree as they are to yourself. But you are fully aware that alcohol is a stumbling-block to innumerable of your fellow-citizens—to the young, the immature, to many who have an inherited proclivity to alcoholic craving, who once they taste alcohol are incapable of moderation. The price to be paid for your personal indulgence (for that is what your personal liberty amounts to) is too great. John Stuart Mill leaves no doubt on this point. 'Whenever there is definite damage, or definite risk of damage, to an individual or to the public, the case is taken out of the province of liberty and placed in that of morality and law.'

Secondly, the organ of your personality is the brain. Alcohol has an immediate action on the brain, and especially on its higher controlling centres. Directly you imbibe alcohol, it passes into your blood and is present in your brain. Its presence in the brain immediately impairs your personality. The more you imbibe, the less becomes your consciousness, until with drunkenness you lose all control of thought, feeling, and action. To take alcohol at all, even in moderation, is in so far a temporary resignation of your birthright as a man, a temporary relegation of oneself to a lower level, a frustration of the soul, a sin against your own highest self. A man cannot achieve freedom of personality by first of all putting his personality under the spell of a drug.

Lastly, whatever a man does has influence upon others. Even if the man himself knows when to stop and does stop (which is another and more difficult matter), others may not be able. An inner impulse they cannot withstand will drive them on. What was comparatively harmless to the one may mean catastrophe to the other. A man is his brother's keeper. 'The love of liberty,' says Hazlitt, 'is the love of others.' This is the opposite, it is the assertion of self, no matter what happens to others.

It is at this point that one parts company with William James. In asking why men take to drink, he discovers the chief impelling force to be the desire for exhilaration, the wish to forget about the present with its monotony of routine, its limitations and menaces of evil. There are times when a man craves, above all other things, for the sense of victory over his surroundings; he reaches out to feel himself something greater than himself. Every man at certain moments would give anything to be like Tam o' Shanter:

> Kings may be blest, but Tam was glorious,
> O'er a' the ills o' life victorious!

And this *is* the feeling a man achieves for the moment, but for the moment only, under the influence of the alcohol drug. But when the philosopher speaks of this as an expansion of the personality, he is wrong. It seems to be, it is felt so to be. But things are not always what they seem. And above all other things strong drink is a mocker:

> To see the world as it is not,
> Look into the pewter-pot.

What happens is the exact opposite. Instead of expanding, the higher self is narcotized and so inhibited. The lower self slipping the leash has its fling.

It is this contrast of the counterfeit and the true which St. Paul brings out when he says: 'Be not filled with new wine wherein is excess, but be filled with the Spirit.' To every man there comes at times a season of exaltation when he is lifted to higher levels of being and feels the fire burn within him and sees golden gates of Eden gleam. And in those hours of vision the great vows are made which it takes a life's work to fulfil:

> Tasks in hours of insight willed
> May be thro' hours of gloom fulfilled.

But it is not under the spell of alcohol that the clear vision comes and the brave purposes are willed. The moment on the mount is a moment we would fain recall, but it does not come at our beck and call:

> We cannot summon when we will
> The fire that in the soul resides.
> The Spirit bloweth and is still
> In mystery the soul abides.

St. Paul warns us that to call in the help of alcohol is not the way.

So far from being a liberation, it is alcohol which makes the worst attacks on the liberty of others and of ourselves. It acts as a cause for a majority of those disorderly attacks upon the person of others which range from indecent assault to murder. It is intimately associated with fornication and venereal disease. At the same time, like morphine, it begets a passionate craving for itself which is more than the victim of it can resist, and becoming 'an addict' he signs a paper committing himself to confinement in some sanatorium or other place of treatment, subjecting his body to rigid restraint in order to save himself from relapse into slavery.

The greatest of all inhibitions upon liberty is, after all, in our time not political but economic. It is poverty. Some say that poverty leads to drink; others that drink leads to poverty. If poverty leads to drink, it is obvious that wealth does not deliver from drink. Two facts may suffice to prove this statement. An increase in the volume of trade always means an increase in the money spent on liquor. In the Colleges of Oxford and Cambridge drunkenness is still a problem. The truth is, of course, that both statements are true. Drink means a decrease of efficiency, and decrease of efficiency means loss of wage-earning power and consequent poverty; poverty in turn drives men to seek forgetfulness of its misery in drink. It is a vicious circle. Certainly economic improvement of itself is never going to deliver us from the tyranny of liquor.

It was Abraham Lincoln, the great liberator, who pointed to the emancipation of the human race from the bondage of alcohol as the next great task that confronted humanity. It is an age-long bondage, deeply entrenched in social custom, strongly buttressed with vested financial interests, willingly accepted by its victims who reap from it a short-lived sensuous pleasure. It can array in opposition to any one who attacks it the great powers of society, finance, politics, journalism, ridicule, the appetitual nature of man. But when it is arraigned before the high tribunal of the conscience of man, the evidence against it is damning and the argument for it is null. Most pitiful and ironical of all is its plea that it stands for human liberty.

Two points are of cardinal importance. The first is that temperance is the way of positive joy, not a curtailment but a fulfilment of life. When the Temperance Movement started a hundred years ago, the emphasis was laid on abstinence. It was a case of cutting oneself off from a definitely established social habit. Thus the way of the abstainer has been associated with negative action, and the phrases in common use such as 'abstinence,' 'prohibition,' and 'local veto,' too often suggest something negative, a maiming so to speak of life, something opposed to the general trend of human desire.

It is high time this was changed. In society to-day it is the drinker who is the exception, and the drinker himself is for the most of his time an abstainer, his drinking is occasional. Abstinence does not imply a social taboo. The most hopeful thing about the Temperance Movement is that it is now seen as the way to fullness and joyfulness of living. It is the way of sport, the way of music, the way of the open-air life, and the great holiday movements which take increasing numbers every year out of the great cities into the country, to the mountains and the sea. The Band of Hope trains the children to think of temperance in terms of social happiness and recreation, and every organization for girls and boys in connexion with settlements and missions, every gate that is opened up for the use of our new and generous leisure into the realms of music, art, and culture, helps the same healthful idea of social joy without the false aid of alcohol. Men are won not by pinched negatives, but by the heartening call of the positive. For joy and health and fullness of living temperance holds all the trump cards.

The second point is that action has got beyond the individual stage; it must be collective.

The first aim of the Temperance Movement was to save the individual from the drink habit. It did not take long to convince temperance workers that the liquor traffic was destroying lives faster than temperance could save them. Collective action was needed if humanity was to be delivered. Under a democracy collective action is only possible when a majority which knows its mind acts positively. It can act only through the State.

Says Georges Clemenceau:

'The State, with all the powerful weapons at its disposal, stands an indifferent spectator of an evil beside which the great epidemics of the past are no more than commonplace incidents in the human drama.' Democracy has yet to realize the moral possibilities of State action and the moral responsibilities of State inaction. 'The great multiplication of virtues upon human nature,' as Bacon says, 'resteth upon societies well ordered and disciplined.' The instrument of further progress is State action.

As things are, a local community has no right to formulate its will in the matter of the continuance or discontinuance of the liquor traffic in its midst. The democratic principle has been made effective in Scotland, but people living in England and Wales have no such power to formulate their will and pleasure and put their decision into force.

The Temperance Campaign is the one great social reform in which the Churches as Churches are united and organized, and they are right in putting this question of Local Option in the forefront of their programme. The way in which the Almighty saves the people is by giving them the power to save themselves. Let the people once feel that the responsibility for the continuance of this traffic and all its attendant evils lies on their own shoulders, and we shall see the process of emancipation begin to go steadily forward.

The liquor traffic to-day stands where the slave traffic stood eighty years ago. Abraham Lincoln foresaw that after the abolition of slavery the next great act of emancipation would be the abolition of the liquor traffic. The rate of advance has been slow since Abraham Lincoln made that prophecy. But taking the large view there is no doubt that the movement of things has been steadily and increasingly in that direction. In spite of the powerful forces of society, of big finance and journalism which are arrayed against us, and—stronger than all these—the doping power of drink itself, men are becoming more and more conscious of what the inevitable end of the struggle is to be. 'Every tree that my Father hath not planted shall be plucked up.'

'If the relative grandeur of revolutions shall be estimated by the great amount of human misery they alleviate and the small amount they inflict, then indeed will this, the temperance revolution, be the grandest the world shall ever win.' The man who said this was the man who struck the death-blow to slavery in the United States of America.

◆

Literature.

HEBREW RELIGION.

A scholarly book in English on Hebrew Religion, elaborate but not too elaborate, has for some time been a desideratum, and now we have it. It is a composite work from the competent hands of Professor W. O. E. Oesterley, D.D., of London, and Professor T. H. Robinson, D.D., of Cardiff. The subjects or periods with which they respectively deal are those which their already published works show that they have made peculiarly their own, Dr. Oesterley dealing with such questions as Ancestor Worship, Demonology, and Wisdom, and Dr. Robinson with the Prophets, though there are not a few points at which each enters the domain of the other.

The book, *Hebrew Religion* (S.P.C.K.; 10s. 6d. net), is divided into three parts: (1) The Background, which discusses primitive religion, with such phenomena as animism and totemism; (2) The Israelite Religion, which carries the story from Moses to the Fall of Jerusalem; and (3) Judaism. The method, which is in the main chronological, is a happy blend of the chronological and the topical, and the conclusions, which are nowhere marred by extravagant idiosyncrasies, would in the main command the assent of most Old Testament scholars to-day. We hear, for example, of occasional traces of imitative magic; we are told that there are good grounds for believing that some remnants of totemism and ancestor-worship are to be found in the Old Testament; that the stones within the Ark were perhaps originally stones taken from the sacred mountain; and that the Sabbath was not borrowed from either the Canaanites or the Babylonians but probably originated among the ancient nomadic Arabs. Those who cannot read Gressmann in the original will be glad to have the sketch of his view of Mount Sinai as a volcanic mountain, which satisfactorily explains so many features of the Exodus narrative and helps us to locate the mountain.

There is a brief but excellent account of the canonical prophets, in which Dr. Robinson repeats the view to which he has already given expression, that the prophets were not implacably opposed to the cult (pp. 201 and 299). While affinities between Babylonian and Hebrew religion are frankly admitted, it is contended that no essential doctrine or religious practice of Judaism was the result of Babylonian religious influence. Persian influence, on the other hand, exercised a real influence, at any rate in the domain of Eschatology and Apocalyptic. The section on Immortality, much as has been written on this subject, is arresting and original. It is interesting to find that the two collaborators do not quite agree in their view of the Servant in Deutero-Isaiah. Dr. Oesterley thinks that the national interpretation is 'quite out of the question'; he takes the Servant to be 'a real, not an idealized man,' who was believed by the prophet to be the Messiah, and who was to rise from the dead to take the part assigned to Him by God.

This statement, like others in the book, as, for example, that 'Yahweh dwelt between the Cherubim' in the early period, will of course be challenged; but the solid learning of the book and its persuasive sketch of the development of Hebrew religion are beyond challenge. The absence of any reference to the universalism of the Book of Jonah is rather surprising; no Old Testament book touches loftier heights than this. There is a curious preference for the word 'forbears' (spelt forebears' on p. 63), cf. pp. 47, 82, 92, 119, 317. On p. 80 Is lv. 2–4 should be lxv. The book effectively meets a real want and ought to receive a wide welcome.

CONTEMPORARY AMERICAN PHILOSOPHY.

'The biographical part of literature is what I love most,' so said Samuel Johnson; and what is true of literature is equally true of philosophy. In any case these two handsome volumes, *Contemporary American Philosophy*, ed. by G. P. Adams and W. P. Montague (Allen & Unwin; 16s. net each), containing personal statements by the best known living American philosophers, are full of interest. Some years ago we had 'Contemporary British Philosophers,' and now is the turn of the American. Thirty-four eminent scholars, chosen by the vote of their brethren, give us short accounts of their life and of their philosophical point of view. If any one longs for unanimity of outlook in the philosophic world as represented by these writers, he will be sadly disappointed. We have all the well-known historical schools of philosophy here, from the absolute idealism of Miss Calkins (tinged with just a little pragmatism) to the instrumentalism of Dr. Dewey and the naturalism of Cohen, as well as the picturesque æstheticism of Santayana. From this kaleidoscopic variety it might almost appear as if philosophy's progress was nothing more than the periodicity of eternal recurrence, for it would not be difficult to place most of these thinkers without undue violence into the framework of the philosophic schools of Greece. And yet there is a difference—a difference of wider horizons, of chastened expectations and of scientific method. The most interesting contribution is perhaps that of the venerable Dr. Palmer, the doyen of philosophic thinkers in America now that William James, Josiah Royce, and Borden Bowne are gone. It is intimately personal and biographical, and, for a philosopher, seriously religious and Christian. From it and from other papers in these volumes we can learn how stimulating and bracing the influence of James and Royce was. This we have found the most interesting of all the papers, and next to it is that of Hartley Burr Alexander, of whose concluding sentences we would simply quote this: 'My courage is little from myself, but much from the sign, upreared on a hill loftier than Acropolis, where through suffering came not the wisdom of the Greeks, but the hope of all mankind.'

On the whole it is heartening to find that so many of the writers, and these among the best, have a religious philosophy of life. In some cases the religion is more a mystical kind of animism or revived Stoicism than positive Christianity, as, for example, in the case of Everett and Leighton (who is surely rather pessimistic as to the present state of education in America). But this is better than naturalism, and of this there is very little, and even it is tinged with an agnosticism which is not far from the Kingdom of God. One or two are frankly materialistic and hostile to Christianity, and a few more are indifferent. But perhaps their indifference is due to restraint and the feeling that philosophy as a discipline had better keep away from religion—for which, methodologically, something may be said.

While it would be unfair to these thinkers to judge them wholly on the meagre pronouncements of these limited chapters, on the other hand a reading of this book will serve as the best introduction to their larger works and as an excellent orientation for the reader who, with little time at his disposal, desires to know what those who are called philosophers think of life and its problems. One general impression abides from the reading of these composite volumes. It is the Socratic longing for a sure word from heaven, a yearning for revelation. It would be invidious to name those whom we think most inspiring, but the chapters by Urban, Tufts, and Perry strike us as above the average. We thank Dr. Muirhead, the Editor of the Library of Philosophy, for this additional obligation to the many others which we owe to his selective and organizing industry.

BEYOND PHYSICS.

Beyond Physics, by Sir Oliver Lodge (Allen & Unwin; 5s. net), is a work which deserves, and will doubtless command, the attention and careful study of all who are interested in the philosophic interpretation of the new physics. The mental attitude of the writer is indicated in the preface. 'If it could be recognized that no one statement can be comprehensive enough to exhaust the whole truth about anything, many of our semi-scientific semi-theological controversies would evaporate into thin air.' While finding himself in general agreement with Professors Eddington and Whitehead, Sir Oliver has some acute criticisms to offer of certain widely accepted theories. He is not satisfied with the theory that simultaneity is conditioned by the speed of light; he is dubious about the paradoxical observations of the hypothetical high-speed observers beloved of relativists; and he is bold enough to hope, in spite of the Michelson-Morley experiment, that some means may yet be found of measuring absolute velocity through the ether.

His main thesis deals with the relation of mind and matter. Physics has by successive steps pushed its analysis of matter to the point where it has reached the electron and found it to be not something material in the old sense, but an energy-knot. The electron itself is now in process of being analysed, and according to some theories, for example Schrödinger's, it is conceived as something in the nature of a group-wave which has a motion and an energy of its own though it is constantly influenced by its constituent waves. Sir Oliver Lodge sees in this a possible solution of an old philosophical difficulty, the difficulty, namely, that if mind influence matter it must needs communicate energy to it, whereas physical analysis can detect no such energy thus communicated. Here, he argues, we have purely physical analysis suggesting that sub-physical entities influence a physical without imparting energy. 'The group waves follow a path determined by the constituent waves, which therefore act as a guiding and directing agent, elusive in itself, but important as exercising control. The present idea is that certain etheric group-waves constitute matter, and that this is a form of energy capable of being guided by something other than energy, something which acts as a guiding or directing principle.' How far this hypothesis meets the philosophic difficulty it would be difficult to say, but there can be no doubt that the theory is a distinct contribution to a profoundly interesting and mysterious subject.

THE JEWS AND THE ASHANTI.

It seems a far cry from the Jews to the Ashanti, but Mr. Joseph J. Williams, Ph.D., Litt.D., has written an extraordinarily interesting book, with the rather unhappy title *Hebrewisms of West Africa* (Allen & Unwin ; 30s. net), to prove that there is a real connexion between the two, or, to be more exact, that 'Hebrew culture found its way, long centuries ago, from the Nile to the Niger.' The sub-title, *From Nile to Niger with the Jews*, gives a better idea than the title of the thesis which the book is written to support, namely, that Jewish colonists in Upper Egypt found their way along the valley of the Nile, profoundly affected Abyssinian culture, in course of time moved across the plains of Central Africa by Lake Chad, and finally reached and left their mark upon the tribes of West Africa. All this, of course, was the work of centuries. But there was another stream of influence from the North. Colonies of Jews studded the African shores of the Mediterranean, and from an early date 'there was a strong Hebraic influence in the North of Africa which through infiltration and commerce had left its mark on the Sahara, and even southward to the neighbourhood of the River Niger.' Indeed there was, south of the Sahara, a Jewish kingdom of Ghana, which had flourished for several centuries and then been so entirely obliterated that its very existence was long questioned, and the site of its capital has only quite recently been located.

Dr. Williams claims that there are remarkable affinities between Jewish and Ashanti ideas, customs, and even languages. No possible claim, of course, could be made that they belong to the same linguistic group, but 'not a few Hebrew words and possibly certain distinctive Hebrew constructions have been ingrafted on the native language of the Ashanti'—and illustrations are given. He compares the Ashanti Yame with the Hebrew Yahweh, and emphasizes the 'truly remarkable similarity' not only in the words themselves but in the conceptions attached to them. He further enumerates scores of cultural and religious elements which the two peoples have in common; for example, the patriarchal system, uncleanness after childbirth, purification ceremonies, sterility a curse, the 'oath-drink,' expectation of a Messiah, Sabbath rest, Levirate marriages, bloody sacrifices with the sprinkling of blood upon altar and doorposts, etc.; and he finds in the phrase, to 'make obi,' which has come to Jamaica through the old Ashanti slaves, an exact parallel to עָשָׂה אוֹב in 2 K 21[6]. While fully recognizing that many of the features he mentions can be paralleled in the religions and cultures of other peoples, he believes that, in their cumulative effect, they can be most satisfactorily explained by assuming that 'in the dim past, a wave, or more probably a series of waves, of Hebraic influence swept over Negro Africa, leaving unmistakable traces among the various tribes, where they have endured even to the present day.' Dr. Williams offers it as his personal conviction, after eleven years of research, that, 'explain it as you will, a Jewish element is to be found in the parent-stock of the Ashanti.' He modestly adds, 'We cannot postulate any degree of certitude for this theory,' but he has spared no pains to substantiate it. His interesting pages are crowded with excerpts from the works of scholars, travellers, and anthropologists, and his bibliography runs to over one thousand names. His argument—if, as he thinks, 'time will strengthen its credibility'—will compel us to enlarge our idea of 'the Dispersion.'

INDIVIDUAL PSYCHOLOGY.

Vienna seems to be the seed-plot of new psychologies. It produced Freud, did it not? And it has sheltered Dr. Alfred Adler, whose system goes under the name 'Individual Psychology.' This is, like Freudism, a psychotherapy and also a pedagogy (is it necessary to have quite such hideous names for these processes?), but there is systematic thinking behind it, and Dr. Erwin Wexberg, a co-worker of Adler's, has set himself to expound this system in his book *Individual Psychology* (Allen & Unwin ; 15s. net). The book is translated by Dr. W. Béran Wolfe, and reads fairly easily, or at least naturally. Not that the matter is easy. There is a sort of ponderous vagueness which makes it difficult for the English reader to grasp exactly where individual psychology differs from any other psychology. The central point seems to be that every living organism is a purposive or conative unity 'whose goal is the maintenance of its own existence.' The evolution of this personality is traced, and the factors, social and economic, sexual, family, pedagogic, which contribute to its existence and growth, are handled in a series of chapters.

There are not a few points at which an acute difference of opinion will arise. Dr. Wexberg is so impressed by the faults of parents and the defects of family life that he thinks the education of children should be a communal affair. It is, however, in the chapter on education that one feels most disposed to question some conclusions. 'Any one,' says the author, 'who investigates the matter objectively must be convinced of the fact that religious concepts cannot be taught to children . . . . no child can understand the spiritual content of religion. Any one who desires to educate his children to be religious men and women would do well never to mention a religious concept to them before they are fourteen or fifteen years old. . . . Religious education of children can have but one consequence: the inhibition of the free development of the child's sense of personal self-esteem.' It would be disrespectful to say what we think of this extraordinary opinion. But, no doubt, a practical teacher who knows anything about children will be able to supply the missing words.

These points are not, however, vital to the general thesis. And it is only fair to say that the development of the organism is traced with great ability, and the treatment of its ills, defects, and faults, medically and otherwise, is expounded from the point of view of this system clearly and fully. Those who wish to know what Adler's standpoint and technique are will find an authoritative statement in this large and competent volume.

PRAYER.

Prayer, by Mario Puglisi (Macmillan; 10s. 6d. net), is interesting as exhibiting the international solidarity of the study of religion. The author is an Italian liberal modernist who has already some thirteen books to his credit. Here he deals with the fascinating theme of prayer, on which so much has been written of recent years that one can read this book in the light of Heiler and Hastings and others. The standpoint is that of a modified mystical pragmatism, and the method is the historical and comparative one so much in vogue through the comparative study of religion.

The writer traces the manifestations and methods of the prayer life from the hazy dawn of magic right down to the philosophic and pantheistic theory of acquiescence of soul in the world process, so that there is danger that we cannot see the wood for the trees. There is much information and thought in this excellent work, besides the value and imperative need of prayer both in its individual and communal aspects.

We welcome the book for it helps us to answer what in our opinion is the real problem of prayer for us to-day. Behind the problem of prayer is our view of God. Is He and is His will an unalterable law in the scientific view of law, or can He act personally in response to His children's needs? Is prayer just a cable or boat-hook which we project to draw our feeble bark to the immovable Rock of Ages, or can He come to our help in our necessities, or can these two views be harmonized? The writer helps us to answer this, and he writes with an earnest practical purposiveness and a broad cultured outlook. As we read we feel like saying, 'Lord, teach us to pray.' The translator, Dr. Allen, has done his work well, for the book reads as smoothly as if it had been written directly in English. But why is there no index?

A NEW TRANSLATION OF THE PSALMS.

Professor Herbert H. Gowen, D.D., of Washington, offers *A New Transcription and Translation of the Psalms* (S.C.M.; 7s. 6d. net). This he prefaces by a well-written Introduction which deals, among other things, with the Principles of Hebrew Poetry, the Poetry of the Psalms and the Use of the Psalter. The main object of the book, however, is to recover, so far as possible, the original text and to present it in the form of a translation which will do something like justice to its literary values. The innumerable textual problems have been frankly faced, and verses, such as 49^{15}, which are for metrical or other reasons believed to be glosses, are excluded from the text and relegated to the notes. Often drastic, but reasonable, emendations are accepted and incorporated in the translation; cf. 45^{6}, where an original יהיה ('shall be'), as it seems, has become first יהוה, and then אלהים ('O God'); similarly 84^{7}, 'From rampart to rampart they go: *El Elohim in Zion is seen.*' On this principle, however, instead of 'Truly God to Israel is good: To the pure in heart' (73^{1}), we should have expected Dr. Gowen to give us 'Truly God is good to the upright, even Elohim (or Yahweh?), to the pure in heart.'

The historical origin of a psalm is frequently suggested, though obviously this must be in most, if not in all, cases conjectural: for example, Ps 46 is assigned to the reign of Hezekiah or Josiah; Ps 110 to the second century B.C., with Simon for its theme; Ps 74 to the destruction of Jerusalem by Nebuchadrezzar—this last psalm being adapted by a Maccabean editor to his own times. Good use is made of the ancient versions; for example, the LXX is followed in 90[3], 'O turn not man back into dust.' While exception could be fairly taken to occasional phrases—we do not, for example, admire 'He shall not drowse' in 121[4]—the translation on the whole is both dignified and musical, and is certainly a very honest and not unsuccessful attempt to penetrate beneath later accretions and glosses to the original text. These few lines from Ps 39 will illustrate the style and quality of the translation:

I said: I will look to my ways:
  Lest I sin with my lips.
I was dumb and kept silence from good:
  Though sore was my pain.
Hot within was my heart in my musing:
  Smouldered the fire.
Then I spake with my tongue: Let me know,
  O Yahweh, mine end!

Creative Preaching, edited by Mr. G. Bromley Oxnam (Abingdon Press; $2.50), is a rich, stimulating volume on preaching, entrancing in its variety. We began it in a listless mood, for books on preaching are often dull, but we ended with a feeling of elation. From the first lecture by Dr. James Moffatt, emphasizing the majesty and mystery of great preaching, to the last, which deals with the contribution of the dramatist to the preacher's material, every paper is distinctive and notable. The literary qualities of the book are worthy even of traditional Boston, and yet, deeper than the literary flavour, and more impressive, are the unfailing touch with reality, the consciousness of the preacher's high vocation, and the conviction, to use the words of Newman, that 'the supreme motive of the preacher is the salvation of the hearer.'

The modern situation, with its changed atmosphere and outlook, is here poignantly portrayed, as in Dr. Sockman's contribution and elsewhere, but over against it all there is the vivid realization of the power of Christ to save and uplift men. The most moving paper, in many respects, is that by Mr. Poling, reminding us of 'Down in Water Street.' It is a transcript from life, preaching Methodism in action at its best.

It is refreshing to find a working minister not only with a comprehensive knowledge of literature and an acute perception of its various values, but also with the power to communicate to his readers his own cultured enthusiasm. We can safely say all this, and more, of Dr. Lynn H. Hough, minister of the American Presbyterian Church at Montreal. His book, *The Artist and the Critic* (Abingdon Press; $1.50), is delightful from beginning to end. It is written with relish and almost abandon, as if Dr. Hough immensely enjoyed the job, and this enjoyment is infectious. Briefly stated, the content of the book is as follows: Euripides is taken as the typical artist. We are told all about him and his environment, and we are led on to consider the perspective and spirit of the artist in many other great works. Lucian is taken as the typical critic, and, when he is sufficiently expounded, we have the main points illuminated similarly by other writers. Finally, the fusion of artist and critic is found in Dante, and all lovers of Dante will thank Dr. Hough for his chapters on the conditions that limited him and the use he made of them.

There has been of late a good deal of excellent writing on the ministry of the Holy Spirit, so much so that one wonders at the complaint made by the Rev. Raymond Calkins in his book, *The Holy Spirit* (Abingdon Press; $1.50), that the subject has been greatly neglected. Perhaps he is thinking of his own country. In any case Mr. Calkins has done his best to supply the lack, and it is a good best. His book is not theology; nor is it simply devotion. There is a great deal of sound thinking in it, and there is also an earnestness which amounts sometimes to passion. The writer is convinced that what the Church needs, and what the individual needs, is a baptism of the Spirit, and few will question his conviction. But this point is pressed on us in this book in so practical a fashion and with such a flame of urgency that it becomes a challenge to our faith.

The 'St. Louis Post-Dispatch' is an American journal which has celebrated its jubilee by the publication of a number of essays by well-known writers representative of all nations and all points of view. These have been collected and published under the title *The Drift of Civilization* (Allen & Unwin; 7s. 6d. net). The list of contributors includes Maxime Gorky, Bertrand Russell, J. B. S. Haldane, Dr. Einstein, Sir Philip Gibbs, Dean Inge, H. G. Wells, and Stephen Leacock, to name only the most familiar. Their papers are supposed to summarize what (as they believe) is the drift of things in various regions of thought and activity. Some of the writers take their task seriously, like Dr. Einstein, who gives us a glimpse of 'The New Physics,' and M. M. A. Nexö, an ardent Communist who already sees Satan (the bourgeois society) fallen as lightning from heaven. Others, like Dean Inge, ramble along pleasantly about things in general, or, like Gorky, apparently ignore their instructions and write reminiscently. One of the most interesting essays is that by Sir Philip Gibbs, who reveals the fact that just before the Armistice Britain and America had got ready a form of attack which would have practically blotted out the German armies and made Hell of some of their towns. On the whole the essays in this book are interesting, and even, in a few cases, of considerable value.

What is the aim of education? This question is as old as man, at least as old as Solomon and Plato, and this is the question which Professor William C. Bower attempts to answer in *Character through Creative Experience* (Cambridge University Press; 11s. 6d. net). In America, with its mixture of races and cultures, the question is poignant and pressing, and any attempt to answer it seriously is praiseworthy. On a superficial reading one might think that the present author had delivered himself over to the hands of the Behaviourists, for we read about the necessity of knowing everything about the pupil, from his simple reflexes to the condition of his endocrine glands. Undoubtedly all this is important, as the old tag '*mens sana in corpore sano*' recognized long ago, but the writer well reminds us, both in the title and in the body of his volume, that the development of character is the aim of the educationist and, indeed, of all good men, and that character is more than these. The writer's behaviourism is not mechanistic but voluntaristic. If we might pass a mild judgment on the method of the writer it would be to the effect that he delights too much in distinctions, and the multiplying of points, like the old Puritan preachers, though he is far from being a Puritan.

What, then, is character? Can we get our ideals simply by analysing the actualities of experience, or do we need to bring them to bear upon experience in a creative and purifying way? Where is this place of ideals, as Plato would call it? The author tells us of the force of environment, and at times gives the impression that all experience is due to that, but just at this very point he is in danger of forgetting his own aim. Personalities are greater than their environment and act teleologically on their surroundings.

His chapter on Religion is somewhat disappointing, nor is it easy for us to believe, in spite of his long historical disquisition on the development of religion, that religion is just the resultant of climate and soil. Surely the writer here is unduly under the influence of the Historicism and Comparative Religionism now associated with the University of Chicago. This *cuius regio eius religio* point of view must be transcended, and at times, though not steadily and wholly, the author does this, and it is just at these points that he is most persuasive.

Life's Greatest Victory, by the Rev. H. W. Morrow, D.D. (James Clarke; 5s. net), contains a series of twenty-one addresses to young men and women. They are brief and pointed, the titles in many cases are happily chosen, and there is a considerable wealth of illustration.

The Outcast Christ, by the Rev. E. H. Phillips, M.A. (James Clarke; 5s. net), is a careful and detailed study of the records dealing with the trial, death, and resurrection of Jesus. The author, who was a chaplain in Palestine during the War, has used his local knowledge to good account, and has supplemented it by a thoughtful reading of the relevant literature, including the Apocryphal writings. He lays stress on the hypothesis that Jesus, in consequence of excommunication by the Sanhedrin, became One whom it was unlawful to name. 'We comprehend the complete silence of the Jewish historians of His own day. When He became finally excommunicate, the closing words of His condemnation would be uttered by all present: "There is no Jesus of Nazareth. There never was. There never will be."' This is a book which is full of interesting suggestions, especially in regard to the Resurrection, and it will repay the attentive reader.

Mercy and Faithfulness: Studies in the Gospel according to St. John, by the Rev. Thomas Gregory, D.D., Minister-emeritus of St. Columba Church, Kilmacolm (James Clarke; 5s. net), is a charming and uplifting book. The author is a clergyman of the Church of Scotland who was known to a previous generation much better than to this. He was a noted scholar, with a cultured and delicate mind, and it is pleasant to have this fruit of his ministry. The book is really an exposition of the Fourth Gospel, paragraph by paragraph, but in a broad and suggestive fashion. The main truth in each section is disentangled and illustrated, and in the treatment there is an unction of the true kind.

Mr. Abraham I. Schechter, Ph.D., offers a series of learned *Studies in Jewish Liturgy* (Dropsie College, Philadelphia; $2.00) based on a unique MS. entitled 'Seder Ḥibbur Berakot' (Order of a Collection of Benedictions), which contains scores of very old prayers, *piyyutim* and *seliḥot*, whose authors are unknown. In the first part Dr. Schechter discusses the origin of this Seder and comes to the conclusion that it was compiled by Menaḥem b. Solomon in the first half of the twelfth century, and that it represents in the main the Palestinian Ritual which had become the fixed ritual of the Italian Jews. An Italian atmosphere pervades the MS. throughout: till the latter part of the ninth century, Palestinian influence upon Italy was strong, and the Italian Jews looked towards Palestine for spiritual comfort and instruction. Despite the preponderatingly Palestinian nature of the Italian rite, however, the Seder not unnaturally reveals traces of Babylonian elements, introduced doubtless by Babylonian Jews who had migrated to Palestine and who naturally influenced the usages of the synagogue. The second part of the book contains the text of and notes on some of the prayers, for example, morning and evening prayers, grace after meals; and there are several photographs of facsimile pages of the MS.

In connexion with the fifteen hundredth anniversary of St. Augustine's death, the mind of Christendom naturally turns to the teachings and spiritual experiences of one who is confessedly the greatest Christian thinker since St. Paul. A book which in the circumstances is very opportune and which deserves a warm welcome is *St. Augustine's Conversion*, by the Rev. W. J. Sparrow Simpson, D.D. (S.P.C.K.; 10s. 6d. net). The term 'conversion' is here used in a somewhat wide sense to include the whole of Augustine's spiritual development to the time of his ordination. This development 'has not only a historic and a human value, but is also at the same time a very real guide and encouragement amid the perplexities of the modern mind. It reminds us how ancient many a problem is which our century has a curious habit of regarding as something quite original and new.' Dr. Sparrow Simpson is evidently a close and sympathetic student of St. Augustine's works. He traces with great patience and insight the various steps by which Augustine passed through Manichæism and scepticism to Neo-Platonism and thence to a settled Christian faith. Bearing in mind that the 'Confessions' were not written till thirteen years after the spiritual crisis, Dr. Simpson has gathered from Augustine's earlier works all references bearing upon his spiritual history, and from these more nearly contemporary sources has supplemented and to some extent corrected the 'Confessions.' The author is to be congratulated on a fine piece of work which combines in a rare degree sound scholarship with warm Christian feeling.

For the ordinary reader *Christian Dhyāna* is a confusing little book, and, worse than that, he has the feeling that it is made so quite unnecessarily. Yet there are reasons that explain this. The little volume (S.P.C.K.; 2s. 6d. net) arose thus. Mr. Verrier Elwin at the close of a lecture on Christian Mysticism heard the Brahmin chairman remark that 'he was delighted to find *even in Christianity* an interest in the method and philosophy of prayer.' This stung him; and as a result he has issued, chiefly for Indian minds, his study of that fine old mystic classic, 'The Cloud of Unknowing.' One wishes it all success in its primary object. But it is not likely to have a large welcome in the West. For one thing, the Cloud is not meant for every one; there are those who would find its atmosphere, its conception and practice of prayer, stuffy and unaired beyond bearing—a hot-house kind of place. For another, in the attempt to reach the Indian mind the pages are thickly bestrewn with Indian terms—quite simple for any one with any knowledge in those fields, but irritating and repelling to those who have not. And, indeed, even keeping that first end in view, the thing is overdone, a little childishly. And for a third, things are so overlaid by continual Indian parallels and similarities, and so on, that what the Cloud itself stands for is not always easily followed.

The very title is not likely to lure Western readers. *Dhyāna* is defined by Bāladeva as 'thinking on one subject continuously, without the inrush of ideas incongruous with the subject and thought.' 'Christian Dhyāna therefore,' says Mr. Elwin, 'will be the steady flow of loving attention to God of a soul which is "in Christ," whose environment and life is Christ.'

Biblical chronology has a curious fascination for certain minds, and the Rev. A. T. Richardson has fallen under the spell of it. Accepting the accuracy of the Biblical statements, he fills the pages of his

Bible Chronology (E. & F. N. Spon; 12s. 6d. net) with dated events—the recorded dates, which occupy the left-hand column, ranging from 1880 B.C. to 513 B.C. By reckoning 100 moon-shanahs (as he calls them) as = 8·085 tropical years, he reduces the years of Abraham's predecessors to reasonable dimensions. Methuselah, for example, dies, aged 78, in 1695 B.C.; Noah dies, aged 77, in 1666. From Gn 11[27] the ages are given in 'season-shanahs.' On this scheme, Abram, who was born in 1485, 'reigned' from 1448 to 1398 B.C. The book displays much ingenuity, which, we fear, will not greatly advance the cause of Biblical chronology.

Fundamentalism in this country is neither so rare nor so negligible as many people imagine. Those who are in touch with youth know that it is quite common among those who might be supposed to be opposed to its standpoint. In all probability this is due partly to misunderstanding and partly to ignorance. In either case the need of enlightenment is urgent. And this could hardly be more effectively given than it is in *Letters to a Fundamentalist*, by Mr. Percy Austin, B.A., with a foreword by Principal Garvie (S.C.M.; 6s. net). Mr. Austin writes to a friend who is a fundamentalist, and in his letters discusses all sorts of points that arise from his friend's position and that are at issue between the two attitudes. The whole gamut is here—science and the Bible, 'apparent contradictions,' the nature of prophecy, inspiration and authority. The author is not a modernist in the extreme sense. He claims to be both a fundamentalist (in the true sense) and a modernist (in the better sense), and he is always reasonable, reverent, and pointed. There is hardly a difficulty that has been raised in connexion with the Bible that is not faced and discussed here. And we could not well imagine anything better calculated to disarm and to instruct any one who is suspicious of the modern attitude to the Bible, and yet has anything of an open mind.

Among Christian people there is to-day a strong desire to see Christian standards applied in business and in industrial organization. There are many who will roundly say (as one speaker did say at a conference on the subject), 'You cannot live a Christian life within the [present] system.' Is that true? And if so, are Christian standards to go? Or is the present system to go? The Christian Social Council, in its Research Section, has been investigating the subject, and the result of its provisional inquiries has been published in a volume, *The Just Price*, containing essays by various writers, and edited by Mr. V. A. Demant, B.Litt., B.Sc. (S.C.M.; 4s. 6d. net). The starting-point of the inquiry was the mediæval doctrine of the 'Just Price' and its application in that age, and the goal was the possibility of an equivalent to-day. It is obvious that the simpler conditions of mediæval life made the fixing of a just price comparatively simple. The conditions to-day are totally different, more complicated, and made specially formidable by the altered value of money and the whole financial organization. So that the problem is really whether the conception of justice behind the mediæval 'Just Price' can be translated into a modern equivalent. The whole situation is discussed in these essays with immense ability by writers who not only have the Christian standpoint, but who face their problem in a sane spirit and with a wide knowledge of what it implies.

St. Augustine, by Eleanor McDougall, D.Litt. (S.C.M.; 3s. 6d. net), while it gives a sufficient outline of the great Christian thinker, is mainly a study of his personal religion. This is done with great reverence and sympathy. It is perhaps natural that the writer, whose life-work is in Madras, should have Indian thought constantly present to her mind. At the same time it seems unfortunate that she should have made such large use of the term *bhakti* in speaking of Augustine's devotion to God. To many readers the term will be meaningless, and in itself it is open to objection from its association with pantheism. Augustine was no pantheist any more than St. Paul, and it is not helpful to speak of the one as 'the Bhakta of Christ,' or of the other as 'that chief of bhaktas.' The book, however, is extremely readable, and, besides painting a sketch of Augustine's time, it succeeds in bringing the lovable and Christian side of the man into clear view.

◆

A Study in 1 Corinthians xv.

By the Reverend Canon Bindley, D.D., Denton, Norfolk.

This doctrinal section, nearly at the close of St. Paul's letter, was not written, so far as appears, in answer to any question propounded in the letter brought to the Apostle by the Corinthian delegates, such as called forth the passages in chapters 7–14. It was evoked most probably by some reports that had reached St. Paul about the doubts that were felt by some of the Corinthian Christians as to a general resurrection—doubts arising apparently from grossly materialistic views as to the nature of the resurrection body.

I. The first seven verses give us a glimpse into the customary course of teaching which the Apostle pursued in his missionary labours. The atoning death of Christ, followed by His Resurrection on the third day, formed some of the essentials of his preaching; and these keynotes of doctrine the Corinthian Christians all held. Belief in *Christ's* resurrection was their firm faith. And so, the opening phrases, which are so often wrongly taken to be formal proofs of Christ's resurrection, are merely reminders of the ABC of the Christian faith which St. Paul had impressed upon his converts. He was not in the least concerned to prove to them that Christ had risen: that was unnecessary. His object was to convict the dubious ones of an absurd fallacy in their logic. They believed that Christ had risen, and yet maintained, in opposition to this particular affirmative, the universal negative proposition that 'a resurrection of dead men is impossible.' They admitted the resurrection of Christ, but looked upon it as of such unique character as to yield no basis for deduction as to other resurrections.

In a series of short terse dilemmas the Apostle points out the miserable position into which their logical fallacy led them and left them. It robbed them of their foundation belief and of all the benefits of the salvation that Christ had brought; and it rendered nugatory such practices as 'baptism for the dead,' and cut at the root of all Christian self-sacrifice. How could they be so short-sighted as to allow the first-fruits but deny the harvest which the first-fruits implied? They forgot that everything, including death, was to be subdued by Christ; and that in Him were incorporated His followers, the members of His Body. Let them beware of being led astray, by those who denied a future resurrection, into a maze of corrupt or careless living. Doctrinal error would certainly issue in moral decline.

This brief summary, I think, covers the first thirty-four verses of the chapter. But a few points in the course of the argument need a little closer notice.

Vv.[3, 4, 5] have all the appearance of being a quotation from an early official formula of what the Apostle calls the 'first or foundation principles' of Christian belief:

'Christ died for our sins according to the Scriptures,
And was buried,
And was raised on the third day according to the Scriptures,
And he appeared to Kephas, then to the twelve . . .'

Now what Scriptures are referred to in accordance with which Christ died for our sins and rose again the third day? Would that St. Luke had preserved for us the Lord's own exegesis of the Sacred Writings when, beginning from Moses, and from all the Prophets, He interpreted (διερμήνευσεν) to them in all the Scriptures the things concerning Himself (Lk 24[27]). We should have had the deepest of all 'hermeneutics' for our enlightenment and guidance. Our Lord is apparently made to include 'the third day' in O.T. prophecy (Lk 24[46]), and it is remarkable that so slight a detail should have been noted and have riveted itself into the Creeds.

The question arises, Ought we to restrict the phrase 'according to the Scriptures' to the fact of the Resurrection only, or extend it to the exact day of the event—the third day? In the first case, if we restrict it only to the *fact* of the Resurrection, we can supply Scripture proof from that employed by St. Peter on the Day of Pentecost from Ps 16—'Thou wilt not leave my soul in Hades, nor suffer thy holy one to see corruption.' And he may have used this text on the authority of the Risen Lord Himself. But if Scripture proof is demanded for 'the third day,' it may be possible to elicit some light from those details of the Passover ceremonial which were at the moment engrossing the mind of the Apostle.

It was just before the Passover of the year 56 when St. Paul at Ephesus received the Corinthian letter and deputation. When he replied, the Passover had come, with its accompanying presentation of the first-fruits 'on the morrow after the sabbath' (Lv 23^{9-21}); and the Apostle's heart and thoughts were full of the Scriptures which dealt with that festival, and were concentrated on the True Paschal Lamb, who, as the First-fruits, had fulfilled in every particular all that was foreshadowed in the ancient ritual. References palpable and patent, as well as allusive and inferentially latent, abound throughout the Epistle. '*Our* Passover is sacrificed for us — Christ.' 'A little leaven leaveneth the whole lump.' 'Purge out the old leaven, and keep festival with the unleavened bread of sincerity and truth.' He refers to the Passage of the Red Sea, which was a Passover theme; and, above all, names Christ as the 'First-fruits.' And there, I think, we arrive at the point of the emphasis laid upon 'the third day'; for the passage in Leviticus particularizes the importance of the first-fruits being presented 'on the morrow after the sabbath,' that is, on the third day after the Passover, and therefore on the first day of the week. (So Professor Bacon, *Expositor*, December 1923.)

Is it not curious that in the list of Resurrection appearances there is no reference to the appearances to the women on Easter morning? We are accustomed to envisage the story of the Resurrection from the women's statements in the Synoptists, whereas we probably ought to take it from the official account communicated to St. Paul, reproduced by him in his preaching to the Corinthians, and again reiterated in this—the very first documentary evidence of the Resurrection that we possess—where we see that he did not adduce the women's testimony at all. His list of appearances is not perhaps meant to be exhaustive, but he mentions six important cases, perhaps as being more easily verified and of unimpeachable trustworthiness, or perhaps because the women's various stories were not known or not officially recorded. At any rate his story is not the Jerusalem story, but probably the Antiochene.

In v.[22] the phrase 'as in Adam all die, so also in the Christ shall all be made alive,' implies that St. Paul believed the 'Adam' in the Creation stories in Genesis to be an historical personage; but the ambiguous meaning of the Hebrew word, which may be either a proper or a common noun, leaves it open for us to understand the 'Adam' as denoting man in his lower physical nature as one of the animal creation upon whom death passes, as distinct from the spiritual side of man's personality which constitutes the higher supernatural aspect of man as a child of God.

In vv.[23-26] we get the Pauline view of a Millennium, which approximates closely to some of the current Jewish apocalyptic beliefs. A universal resurrection is contemplated; but there are various stages in its accomplishment. Each rises in his own order or troop (τάγμα). First, there is the resurrection of Christ. That was a matter of history. He was the first-fruits of a harvest to follow, the 'firstborn from the dead' (Col 1^{18}). Then, after an interval of uncertain length, the resurrection of those who are Christ's at His coming. Then, finally, after the reign of Christ on earth which is occupied with the destruction of all that is opposed to God, the abolition of death. The future age begins at the close of this reign of Christ, when the kingdom is delivered over to the Father.

Three points emerge here. First, a question of translation. Is τὸ τέλος a noun or an adverb? It cannot be a noun. 'Then cometh the end,' as A.V. and R.V. take it, supplying the verb 'cometh.' It was not even the beginning of the end, for the beginning of the end is Christ's Coming, the Parousia. Nor is it the absolute end, for St. Paul goes on to speak of a further event after the abolition of death, namely, the subjection of the Son to the Father—an idea which finds only occasional expression in the New Testament. τὸ τέλος must therefore be an adverb, as in 1 P 3^{8}, and be translated 'finally.' Then the passage will run quite intelligibly like this:

> 'Every one in his own order: Christ as first-fruits: next, those who are Christ's at his coming: then, finally . . . the *last* enemy shall be destroyed, Death.'

It is one long sentence with two parentheses in the middle of it, quite in Pauline style. All that is necessary is to alter the punctuation, and to substitute 'at' for the supposititious 'cometh' in our versions. [So Professor Burkitt, *J.T.S.*, July 1916.] Then the whole would now run in our versions: 'Christ the first-fruits: then they that are Christ's at his coming: then at the end—when he shall deliver up the kingdom to God, even the Father, when he shall have abolished all rule and all authority and power—for he must reign till he hath put all his enemies under his feet—the last enemy shall be abolished, Death.'

The second point is this. If a universal resurrection is implied in v.[22], and if the Resurrection at Christ's Coming is limited to those who are His, then there must be a later resurrection in *their* order of those who are *not* His, the unbelievers, before the final consummation of all things. St. Paul did believe in a resurrection of the wicked as well as of the righteous, if his speech before Felix is correctly reported in Ac 24[15]—'that there shall be a resurrection both of the just and unjust.' But the ordinary Jewish belief was that resurrection was a privilege reserved for the righteous. And that belief is perhaps reflected in the phrase which St. Paul uses in Ph 3[11], 'If by any means I may attain to the resurrection from the dead'—it was a reward, not a necessity.

The third point is this. The reign of the Messiah was not itself the future age, but the introduction to it, and the resurrection of the just takes place at the beginning of this reign. In 2 Es 7[28] the duration of this reign is put at 400 years; in other accounts it is fixed at 40 or 600, or 1000 or 2000 years. The period of 1000 is adopted by St. John in the Apocalypse (20[4f.]), where we find again exactly the same three stages: first, the Millennium of 1000 years; then, the second resurrection, that is, of the wicked; and thirdly, the destruction of death.

In v.[29] we come to the *crux interpretum*—'those who are baptized for the dead.' The point of the argument is quite plain. Baptism presupposes a resurrection. If the future resurrection is a mistake, then the sacrament is a farce. But if the argument is clear and unequivocal, the exact custom referred to is most obscure. The early Greek Fathers understood it of ordinary Christian baptism. Others, mostly Western and modern commentators, explain it either of vicarious Christian baptism of living proxies for deceased relatives, or of converts led to baptism out of affection for deceased Christian friends. That the idea of vicarious lustrations for the dead was not alien to Jewish thought is proved by the action of Judas Maccabæus recorded in 2 Mac 12[38f.] where a sacrifice or sin-offering was offered on behalf of those who had died when ceremonially unclean, with a view to their resurrection. 'For if he were not expecting that they that had fallen would rise again, it were superfluous and idle to pray for the dead.' The whole passage is worth study.

And then in v.[32] comes the surprising suggestion that if the Apostle exposed himself to an almost certain death by becoming a beast-fighter in the arena at Ephesus, there would be nothing to be gained by his doing so, if there were no future life. This, I take it, is an imaginary supposition, for as a Roman citizen St. Paul could not be subjected to such an ordeal. That is the objection to taking the illustration literally; though we all know the charming story of St. Paul and the baptized lion in the arena at Ephesus—a bit of second-century fanciful embroidery on this very passage. But there is just the possibility that there had really been some incident, to which we have no further clue, which gave point to this particular illustration. Κατὰ ἄνθρωπον means 'as men do,' with merely human motives, seeking applause, money, or release from incarceration.

II. Let us now turn to the second part of the chapter, which deals with the nature of the resurrection body. Obviously the objectors whom St. Paul answers had been led to their denial of the general resurrection by a curious materialism in their view of the resurrection body. Two points puzzled them—the manner of the resurrection, and the kind of body the raised ones would bear. 'How are the dead raised, and with what manner of body do they come?' St. Paul's answer is drawn from simple analogies in Nature. The seed, which even the objector himself sows, perishes as to its outward husk, in order to let the germ of life within it clothe itself with a new organism, which retains a principle of identity with, even though it differs externally from, the original seed. The πῶς, the 'How,' is thus answered by every analogy that we see around us. But what manner of body? ποίῳ σώματι; St. Paul reminds them that there are diversities of bodies of every kind already existing, in form and rank and quality and beauty and glory, in things terrestrial and things celestial, and the immense variety of these is accepted as quite natural because each is determined by God in its own order and proper sphere. Why, then, should there be any difficulty in the conception of a *spiritual* body fitted for a spiritual sphere? God will give to the raised ones spiritual organisms adapted to their new environment. 'What manner of body?' Certainly not a perishable body of flesh and blood. The psychic body which we wear here will be exchanged for the pneumatic body which we shall wear hereafter. But the psychic body comes first: it is, as it were, the scaffolding by means of which the pneumatic body is built. And as assuredly there is a psychic body, so equally assuredly is there a pneumatic body for each of us. The one is of the earth, the other is of heaven. And as we have borne the *eikon* or outward semblance of the earthy, so shall we hereafter bear the *eikon* of the heavenly.

Personality as we know it consists in a union of soul and body; and, if that personality is to continue through death, it must still consist of soul and body; for the body is an essential element of human personality. But the spiritual body will differ from the natural body as much as the butterfly differs from the grub: it will be more glorious, a 'body of glory,' because adapted to its environment of glory. The *σῶμα* in St. Paul's view is the organ of personal consciousness which survives the change or dissolution of the outward fashion or *σχῆμα*. The *σῶμα*, for instance, one might say, of the insect is preserved through the three changes of its *σχῆμα* or *εἰκών* as caterpillar, chrysalis, butterfly.

It is essential for the understanding of St. Paul's argument to grasp the fact that he is not speaking of a dead corpse and its quasi-material revival or resuscitation. That is the very error that he was combating. He is speaking of the resurrection of those whom we call the dead. And he does not say, 'The dead body is sown in corruption and raised in glory.' He is not thinking of burial at all: burial is not within the purview of his argument. The verbs are impersonal. He says *σπείρεται*, 'There is a sowing in corruption,' and *ἐγείρεται*, 'there is a raising in glory.' And the sowing is not the burial of the dead body, but the planting of our individual lives here on earth. This is absolutely clear: because the order in St. Paul's mind is sowing, death, resurrection; whereas the common view that he is thinking of burial would demand the order death, sowing, resurrection. The sowing, as in the case of the seed, must precede the death, not follow it. There would be no use in sowing dead seed: it is living seeds that must be sown. The analogy demands that we should be sown living, not dead; and that implies our being sown on this earth. Neither seeds sown ***in*** the earth, nor we sown ***on*** the earth perish in the dissolution of death. The idea of our life on this earth being a sowing was a familiar one. It underlies the commonest expression of a man's posterity as his seed, and finds explicit statement in 2 Es 5^{48}, where God says, 'I have given the womb of the earth to those that be sown therein in their several generations.'

The corruption, dishonour, weakness, *φθορά, ἀτιμία, ἀσθενεία*, in which our individual lives are sown, represent our subjection to corruption, sufferings, and death—'the weakness of our mortal nature,' and correspond with the Apostle's phrase in Ph 3^{28}, 'the body of our humiliation.' Further, it would be incongruous to speak of a dead corpse, *πτῶμα*, as a *σῶμα ψυχικόν*; yet he says 'there is a sowing of a psychic body.' Nor should we speak of a corpse as 'weak.'

A few subsidiary matters remain.

In vv.$^{51.\,52}$ (as in 1 Th 4^{15}) St. Paul contemplates himself as amongst those who will be alive at Christ's Coming. 'We shall not all sleep, but we shall all be changed.' That is to say, he believed that the *ἐπιφανεία* or *παρουσία* would come in his own lifetime, and in that of the majority of his readers. Hence, to meet any possible objection or question as to what kind of bodies those still living on earth at that solemn crisis would wear when the dead were raised, he asserts that ***all*** must undergo the same change—the dissolution of what is mortal, and the assumption of the body of glory. He describes this change from the body of our humiliation to the body of glory in Ph 3^{21} as a 'refashioning' or change of the outer *σχῆμα*; but how this transformation is effected, he does not tell us, any more than he attempts a description of the pneumatic body. It is probably beyond our present comprehension.

We notice that this conception of the necessity for a transformation of the earthly body before it can inherit immortality is a new element in Pauline thought. In 1 Th 4^{17} no change in the body was contemplated. Apparently those who were alive at the Parousia would, *just as they were*, join the Lord in the air. This idea finds no place here. Flesh and blood cannot inherit the Kingdom of God. This corruptible ***must*** put on incorruption.

Again, nowhere does St. Paul define what he understood by the dead 'sleeping.' It was a purely Jewish idea, yet apparently the O.T. notion of a realm of the dead in Sheol finds no echo in St. Paul's writings. He never uses the word Hades. Did he sometimes think of the dead as awaiting in sleep the summons to awake and undergo the necessary change? In 2 Co $5^{2f.}$ he expresses the belief that the dead pass immediately into the presence of Christ; and also that the spiritual body is actually existent now and ready to be assumed at the moment of death. I imagine that the fact is that no symbolic language can fully and completely portray the spiritual world. Now one aspect of the change is dwelt upon, and now another, and these are not consistent or rationally coherent. Whatever our views may be of death and of the future life, we may be sure that they are utterly inadequate. We cannot fix even the main characteristics of the life of the world to come.

I have one other remark to make. St. Paul does not appeal to the Appearances of the Risen Christ as helping his readers to form an idea of the nature of the resurrection body. And the reason, I think, is this. The accounts in the Gospels are so mysteriously difficult to harmonize that it is almost impossible to form any coherent view of the nature of our Lord's Body after His Resurrection. We cannot envisage in what kind of a body He chose to appear and disappear, and disguise His form, and eat material food 'before' and 'with' His disciples. So that the appearances of the Risen Lord as depicted in the Gospels are least helpful in aiding us to think of our own future spiritual bodies. But suppose that our Lord, instead of being buried as a Jew, had been cremated as a Roman or a Greek—and very many of the bodies of martyrs of all ages have been burned before or after death without involving the smallest doubt as to their future resurrection—there could have arisen no disputes about the empty tomb or the nature of His resurrection body. Yet His resurrection, His victory over death, His continued life in exaltation, would have been equally assured, at any rate to St. Paul, by the revelation that came to him on the Damascene road, and which turned the superbly orthodox Pharisee into a captive slave at the chariot wheels of His Lord and Master. That the flesh and blood material of our Lord's body evanesced, evaporated, sublimated, without undergoing corruption in the tomb is an old theory which was revived some time ago by Latham in his book called *The Risen Master*. This thought may possibly throw light upon St. Paul's statement about all undergoing change, whether dead or alive, at the Coming. But in our case the body does undergo dissolution and corruption; and that shows that the outer husk of our personal individuality here is only an *instrumentum* or temporary mode of expression of our true self, which lives on through and after the experience of death.

National Contributions to Biblical Science.

IV. The Contribution of Germany to Church History: Ancient Church and Reformation.

By Professor James MacKinnon, Ph.D., D.D., Edinburgh.

II.

Next to the history of the Ancient Church, German scholars have eminently contributed to the knowledge of that of the Reformation. The Germans, indeed, claim the Reformation as a German product, and this claim, though not above criticism, is substantially justified by the dominating influence exercised by Luther on the initiation and early development of the movement in Germany and other lands. One is almost snowed under by the mass of the historical literature which has appeared during the last half-century and continues to appear in endless volume, and in which the Germans give unstinted scope to their rage for literary production (*Arbeitswut*). For anything like an adequate account of it in English I may refer the student to the footnotes of my *Luther and the Reformation*, or to the extensive German bibliography of Wolf (*Quellenkunde der deutschen Reformations geschichte*, 1915–23).[1] Corporations and individuals have alike contributed to elucidate this complex movement. As the result of this activity the number of publications in the form of editions of sources or of monographs can only be described as legion. This productivity has been fostered by the *Verein für Reformations geschichte*, whose organ is the *Archiv für Ref. geschichte*. Very meritorious is the interest shown in this historic research by the Prussian Government through its Commission for the investigation of the history of the Reformation and the Counter Reformation, whose foundation is a valuable fruit of the Quatercentenary of the Reformation in 1917. To this celebration the Luther Society (*Luthergesellschaft*), whose organs are the *Lutherjahrbuch* and the *Luther Quarterley*, also owes its existence. For the study of the subject from the Roman Catholic point of view there is the *Historical Studies and Texts* series since 1906, which are supplemented by the numerous publications of the *Görresgesellschaft*.

Among general collections of the utmost value it must suffice to mention the *Deutsche Reichstagsakten* still in course of publication; the series of

---

[1] Kawerau has published a chronological list of Luther's works in particular, *Verein für Reformationsgeschichte*, No. 129, 2nd ed., 1929. See also Albrecht, *Theol. Stud. u. Krit.*, 1926.

Nuntiatur-berichte, containing the Reports of the papal nuncios from Germany to the Vatican; the publications of the Prussian Historical Institut at Rome, which include a number of contributions to Reformation history; the voluminous and standard Weimar edition of Luther's works, still unfinished, and the latest collection of his vast correspondence begun by Enders and continued by Kawerau and others, and containing many letters of Luther's correspondents, including those of the Electors Frederick, John, and John Frederick of Saxony. Those of Melanchthon fill a large number of volumes of the 'Corpus Reformatorum.' The *Corpus Catholicorum* in course of publication furnishes competent editions of the works of Luther's opponents, and the enormous collection of documents relative to the Council of Trent has, in part, been published by the *Görresgesellschaft.* The correspondence of Luther's foremost antagonist among the German princes, Duke George of Saxony, has been edited by Gess, that of his patron, the Landgrave Philip of Hesse, by Lenz. Among the smaller collections of documents those of Löscher (*Reformations-Acta,* 1517–19), Förstemann (*Urkundenbuch*), and Balan (*Monumenta*) are useful. Similarly the more recent ones of Scheel (*Documente zu Luther's Entwicklung bis 1517,* 1929) and Köhler on the Indulgence controversy.

A foremost place among the general surveys of German Reformation history must still be assigned to Ranke's *Deutsche Geschichte* in the edition of the German Academy (1925–26), though the editors could have improved it by more copious critical notes in the light of more recent research. Bezold's *Geschichte der Deutschen Reformation* (1890) is an admirable study of the subject, and the same may be said of the volume of K. Müller's *Kirchengeschichte,* and that of Hermelink in the *Handbuch der K.G.,* edited by Krüger (1929), which treat of the Reformation. Other recent surveys are Brieger's *Reformation* (1914), Pflugk-Hartung's *Im Morgenrot der Reformation* (1926), Brandi's *Deutsche Reformation und Gegenreformation* (1927), Kaser's *Zeitalter der Reformation und Gegenreformation* (1922). The concise exposition of the general causes of the Reformation given by von Below in *Die Ursachen der Reformation* is a counter-blast to Troeltsch's *Bedeutung des Protestantismus* (1911), and other works on the general movement.

From the Roman Catholic point of view the movement is more or less elucidated in Pastor's *History of the Popes,* which is the fruit of the study of the contents of ecclesiastical archives in Germany and Italy, though its objectivity is open to question. Far more vulnerable from this point of view is Janssen's *Geschichte des Deutschen Volkes,* which is written in a too partisan spirit to be generally relied on, though it contains a mass of illuminating material drawn from the sources.

German research in the ecclesiastical history of the sixteenth century concentrates largely on the life and work of Luther as a Reformer. It derived a stimulus from the Quatercentenary of his birth in 1883, and from the discovery of new material, especially the early lectures on the Psalms, Romans, and Hebrews, the notes on Augustine and some of the Schoolmen, etc. It was strengthened by Denifle's violent attack on the Reformer in his *Luther und Lutherthum,* which produced a heavy crop of Protestant vindications. Denifle's thesis is that Luther's breach with the mediæval Church and papacy was the result of a moral collapse, not of genuine religious experience, and he reviews his reforming activity largely in the light of this perverse assumption. The attack showed, however, weak points in the previous Protestant literature on Luther and the Lutheran movement, especially the lack of an adequate knowledge of the Scholastic Theology on the part of Protestant writers. It led to a more intensive study of the later Scholasticism in which Luther was trained. Witness Seeberg's very capable review of the Scholastic Theology in his *Dogmengeschichte,* following on his monograph on *Duns Scotus* (1900). It thus contributed to a new and most fruitful period of Luther research, which during the last quarter of a century has deepened and widened our knowledge of him and the German Reformation.

Besides the biographical matter handed down by Melanchthon, Mathesius, Ratzeberger, Myconius, and other contemporaries, the great mine for the history of Luther and the Reformation is the works, correspondence, and table talk of Luther himself. The standard Weimar edition from 1883 onwards has superseded its Erlangen predecessor, though some of the earlier volumes need revision, and the introductions to most of them are too exclusively devoted to bibliographical and philological matter and do not attempt an evaluation of the contents. A number of excellent selections from his works have been edited by Clemen, Borcherdt, Berger, and others. Among the biographies the solid work of Köstlin, as revised by Kawerau (fifth edition, 1903) still holds the first place, though a new edition, in accordance with more recent research, would make it more serviceable. Hausrath's *Luther,* which comes next in importance, is less thorough, but more readable (new edition by v. Schubert). Berger has attempted to depict Luther in relation to the culture of the time (*Luther in kulturgeschichtlicher Darstellung* (1895, 1921). Troeltsch rather one-sidedly estimates the man and the movement as an embodiment of the mediæval, rather than the modern spirit, in his *Sociallehren der christlichen Kirchen and Gruppen* (1912). Köhler's concise sketch (*Luther und die Deutsche Reformation*, 1917) is a model of its kind. Boehmer's *Luther in the Light of Recent Research* (1918) is a highly valuable estimate and vindication in reply to Denifle and other detractors, though there is a trace at times in this and other German works on Luther of one-sidedness. The Roman Catholic Grisar has devoted three bulky volumes to the arch-heretic of the sixteenth century, which have been translated into English. Though he writes within the limits of prescribed authority and is therefore not objective, he avoids the offensive tone of Denifle, while showing traces of his influence. A large amount of biographical literature is devoted to the elucidation of stages or phases of Luther's life. Naturally the earlier period excites the greatest interest, inasmuch as it is in the years of conflict (to *circa* 1530), as the emancipator of the Church from papal-mediæval domination, that Luther's work is most dramatic and formative. The partial biographers have, therefore, largely concentrated on the earlier Luther. An outstanding example of such works is O. Scheel's *Luther, von Katholicismus zur Reformation* (1916–17). More concise, but illuminative are Boehmer's *Der Junge Luther* (1925), Ritter's *Luther* (1925), Oergel's *Vom Jungen Luther* (1899), A. V. Müller's *Luther's Werdegang* (1920), Stracke's *Luther's grosses Selbstzeugnis* (1926), and the sketches of Neubauer, v. Schubert, Merz, von Walter. The two most recent are those of Wendorf (1930) and Siegfried, *Luther und Kant* (1930).

On the origin and development of Luther's reforming ideas the masterly essays of Holl (*Aufsätze*,[5] 1927) are the most important contribution of recent times. Epoch-making in this connexion are Ficker's edition of the Commentary on Romans (1908 Ger. tr. of the Commentary by Eilwein, 1927), and von Schubert's edition of that on Galatians (1918). Loof's disquisition on his doctrine of Justification (*Stud. und Krit.*, 1917) is also of great value, in addition to A. Ritschl's extensive monograph on the subject. Wolf's *Staupitz und Luther* and Jeremias' *Joh. von Staupitz* are valuable for Luther's relation and indebtedness to the Vicar-General of his Order. The influence of the mediæval mystics on Luther's religious development is elucidated by Hunzinger (1906), A. V. Müller (*Luther und Tauler*, 1918), and others.

For the crucial period from 1517 to 1521, in which Luther enunciated and developed his reforming ideas in conflict with the traditional Church, the works of Kalkoff (*Entscheidungsjahre der Reformation*, 1917, and monographs on Hutten, Erasmus, and the Diet of Worms) are based on intensive research of the relative sources, though some of his conclusions have encountered considerable criticism. Special aspects are treated by a large number of writers, as in Köhler's (1895) and Kohlmeyer's (1922) expositions of Luther's epoch-making Address to the Nobility, Bauer's exposition of the new Wittenberg Theology (*Die Wittenberger Universitäts Theologie*, 1928), Brieger's *Aleander und Luther*, Ficker's *Luther als Professor* (1928), etc.

In the period succeeding the Diet of Worms the salient features are the conflict with the radical wing of the movement, represented by Carlstadt and Münzer and culminating in the Peasant Rising, the organization of the Lutheran evangelical Church, and the Anabaptist movement. On the struggle with the radical reformers Barge's *Karlstadt* (1905) is the most extensive work, though it has been subjected to sharp criticism by K. Müller and others (*Luther und Karlstadt*, 1907). See also Nik. Müller, *Die Wittenberger Beivegung* (1911). Much research has in recent years been bestowed on Th. Münzer as the protagonist of the prophetic-spiritual movement, which was influenced by mediæval mysticism. Witness the recent monographs of Zimmermann (1925), Boehmer (1922), Schulz (1928), Bloch (1922), Holl (1927), which have modified the old superficial estimate. On the Peasant Rising in relation to the Reformation fresh contributions have been made by Stolze (*Bauernkrieg und Reformation*, 1926), Althaus (Luther's *Haltung im Bauernkrieg*, 1925), Brandt (*Der grosse Bauernkrieg*, 1925), Rosenkranz (*Der Bundschuh*, 1927). For Luther's conception of the Church and its constitutional organization there is also a considerable volume of new literature as the result of the discussion of this highly controversial subject. Whilst Luther conceived of the Church as an autonomous spiritual association based on the faith of the individual Christian (the Church as the Communion of Saints), he was driven by circumstances to align it with the civil power in the work of organization. There is thus a certain inconsistency in his attitude to the State, which varies with the attitude of the State towards the Reformation movement, and this lack of a definite policy from the outset is reflected in the controversial tone of the works dealing with this subject, which have not reached anything like exact agreement. Besides the general reviews in the Histories of *Kirchenrecht* (Mejer, 1869; Richter, 1851; Sohm 1892; Bredt, 1921, etc.), the discussion has been enriched by the special monographs of Rieker (1893), Kattenbusch (*Theol. Stud. und Krit.*, 1928), Rietschel (*ib.* 1906), Sohm (*Weltlicher und geistlicher Recht*, 1914), Drews (*Zeitschr. für Theol. und Kirche*, 1908), Hermelink (*Zeitschr. für Kirchen Gesch.*, 1908), Köhler (*ib.* 1917–18), Holl (*Aufsätze*, 1927), K. Müller (*Kirche, Gemeinde, und Obrigkeit nach L.*, 1910), Kohlmeyer (*Entstehung der Schrift Luther's an den Adel*, 1922, and 'Die Bedeutung der Kirche für Luther,' *Zschr. K.G.*, 1928), Meinecke ('Luther über Christliches Wesen,' *Hist. Zeitsch*, 1920), Hashagen (*Zsch. K.G.*, 1922 and 1927), Pallas (*Kirchenregiment in Kursachsen vor der Reformation*, 1910), Althaus (*Die Gemeinde im Lutherischen Kirchengedanken*, 1929). The German territorial church constitutions of the Reformation period have been collected by Richter (*Die Evangelischen Kirchenordnungen des 16ten Jahrhunderts*), and more recently by Sehling, whose work under the same title has, in part, superseded his.

In the practical task of maintaining his distinctive views against dissidents of a variety of type, Luther unfortunately resiled from the cardinal principle of toleration, which he vindicated so nobly in his early conflict with the mediæval Church and Papacy. This is rather tragically apparent in his ultimate attitude towards the Anabaptists and the Spiritual Reformers, who are to be distinguished from the earlier radicals of the Münzer type. This movement has also received an intensive study in a number of German monographs, in some of which at least a more sympathetic and objective treatment of it has become apparent, and which have largely superseded the older works of Ritschl (*Geschichte der Pietismus*, 1880), Keller (*Geschichte der Wiedertäufer*, 1880), Zur Linden (Hoffmann, 1885), Loserth (Hubmaier, 1893), Heberle (Hans Denck, 1851–55). It must suffice to mention those of Tumbült (*Die Wiedertäufer*, 1899), Troeltsch (*Sociallehren*, 1912), Sachsse (Hubmaier, 1914), Detmer (Rothmann, 1904), Geisberg (*Die Münsterischen Wiedertäufer*, 1907), Löffler (*Die W. zu Münster*, 1923), Paulus (*Protestantismus und Toleranz*, 1911), Wappler (*Die Stellung Kursachsens und Landgraf Philipp*, 1910), Nestler (*W. Bewegung in Regensburg*, 1926), von Schubert and Schönebaum (*Kommunismus*, 1919), and H. Ritschl (1923) and L. Müller (1927) on the same subject. The other type of dissent, represented by Schwenckfeld and Franck, which is often wrongly slumped with Anabaptism, has been elucidated by Hartranft in his edition of Schwenckfeld's works (1907–13), Ecke (Schwenckfeld, 1911), Grützmacher (*Wort und Geist*, 1902), Hegler (*Geist und Schrift bei Sch. Franck*, 1892), Reimann (*S. Franck als Geschichtsphilosoph*, 1921), Bornkamm (*Mystik, Spiritualismus*, 1926), Kühn (*Toleranz und Offenbarung*, 1923), Dilthey (*Weltanschauung und Analyse des Menschen seit Renaissance und Reformation*, 1914), Maier (*Der mystische Spiritualismus Weigels*, 1926), Bornkamm (*Luther und Böhme*, 1925). There is, in fact, a marked tendency at the present time to explore more intensively this interesting, but somewhat obscure field of research.

German research has been less interested in the later period of Luther and the Reformation, of which the distinctive feature is the effort to vindicate and consolidate the movement in the face of the papal and imperial attempts to suppress it. Nevertheless the literature on the movement from 1530–46 contains a number of outstanding contributions: for instance, Gussmann's monograph on the Augsburg Confession (1911) and Schirrmacher and Tschackert on the same subject. The quatercentenary of the Confession in the present year has added a goodly array to their number, for which see Liebisch's catalogue, May 1930, 41—42. Von Schubert has illuminated the political negotiations relative to it in 1529–30 in his monograph on *Bekenntnis und Bündnisbildung* (1920), von Walter in *Die Depeschen des Nic. Diepolo*, 1530 (1928). See also Winckelmann on the Schmalkald League (1892), Vetter, *Religionsverhandlungen* (1889), Pruser, *England und die Schmalkaldener* (1929), Rosenberg, *Der Kaiser und die Protestanten* (1903), Moser, *Religionsverhandlungen* (1889), Korte, *Konzilspolsitik Karls V*, 1905, Cardauns, *Geschichte der Kirchlichen Unions und Reformbestrebungen* (1910), Pastor, *Correspondenz des Card. Contarini* (1880), Dittrichs, *Contarini* (1885), Rückert, *Theologische Entwickelung Contarini's* (1926), Druffel, *Kaiser Karl V und du Römische Kurie* (1875), Hasenclever, *Politik Karls V und Landgraf Philipp* (1903), Joachim Müller, 'Politik Karls V am Trienter Konzil' (*Z.K.G.*, 1925), Brandi, *Die Augsburger Religionsfriede* (1927), Susta, *Die römische Kurie und das Konzil von Trent* (1904–14), Schmidt, *Studien zur Geschichte des Konzils von Trent*, 1925, etc. Boehmer's work on Loyola (1914) is the standard German one, and to that of Duhr on the Jesuit order belongs the same predicate.

The distinctive ideas to which Luther gave expression in his didactic and controversial writings have been minutely investigated and elucidated afresh during the last quarter of a century. Hence the plethora of treatises on his theology which issue from the German press year by year, and in which his cardinal principles of justification by faith and the supreme authority of Scripture, the antihierarchical nature of the Church, Christian individuality and liberty have been the subject of keen and often controversial discussion. Some would deny to him the title of theologian, and there is a grain of truth in the denial in the sense that he was not a systematic thinker like Calvin or Melanchthon. But as a creative genius in the sphere of religious thought he is the greatest of all the theologians since Paul and Augustine, and his lofty eminence as a theologian is evidenced by the enormous literature that has been devoted to the exposition of his religious thought. The best German review is perhaps that of Seeberg in the fourth volume of his *Dogmengeschichte* (1917), which is superior to A. v. Harnack's more general survey.

Holl's *Essays* are alike a profound contribution to the themes treated by him and symptomatic of the present reaction from the more purely cultural and ethical to the religious aspects of the Reformation. A new edition of Theodore Harnack's *Luther's Theologie* (1927) is worthy of perusal alongside Loof's *Leitfaden.* As evidence of the concentrated interest on Luther the theologian, see, for example, the recent monographs of C. Seeberg (*Luther's Theologie*, 1929), Hirsch (*Luther's Gottesanschauung*, 1918), Stange (*Studien zur Theologie Luther's*, 1928), Tschackert (*Entstehung der Lutherischen und Reformirten Kirchenlehre*, 1910), O. Ritschl (*Dogmageschichte des Protestantismus*, 1912), Loewenich (*Luther's Theologia Crucis*, 1929), Mensching (*Glaube und Werk bei Luther*, 1926), Preuss *Frömmigkeit Luther's*, 1917), and innumerable articles in the theological journals.

Luther's translation of the Bible, which was alike the grand fruit and force of the movement, has been discussed with ample learning in the recent works of Walther, Risch, Hirsch. On his attitude to the Scriptures, which he critically evaluated, see Scheil, *Luther's Stellung zur Heiligen Schrift* (1902), Thimme under the same title (1903), Preuss, *Die Entwickelung des Schriftsprincips bei Luther* (1901).

Numerous monographs have appeared on Luther's collaborators in the movement. As samples, mention can only be made of Ellinger's *Melanchthon*, Clemen's *Melanchthon und Alex. Alesius* (1929), Diehl's *Bucer* (1904), Thiele on 'Agricola' (*Theol. Stud. und Kritiken*, 1907), Kawerau on the same Reformer under the title of *Joh. v. Eisleben* (1890), Vogt's *Bugenhagen* (1888), etc.

A voluminous literature has been produced on Humanism in relation to the Reformation, with which it was closely associated, though in some respects differing from it in spirit and purpose. Many of the evangelical Reformers had been votaries of the new culture before becoming followers of Luther, and Luther himself was influenced by it, though not so directly, and deeply appreciated it as an adjunct of religious reform. Melanchthon—the Praeceptor Germaniae—is the outstanding representative of this combination of devotion to the new culture and the new cult, and the edition of his works in the *Corpus Reformatorum* is a contribution of great importance to the history of both. Fresh light has been thrown on the movement as influenced by Hutten and Erasmus and other humanists by Kalkoff, Mestwerdt (on Erasmus), Bömer (critical edition of the *Epistolae Obscurorum Virorum*, 1924), von Walter on Erasmus's conception of Religion (1906), Wernle on the Renaissance and the Reformation (1912), Ritter, 'Geschichtliche Bedeutung des Deutschen Humanismus' (*Hist. Zeitschr.*, 1923), Hermelink (*Religiose Reformbestrebungen des Deutschen Humanismus*, 1907), etc.

German scholars have also contributed to the elucidation of the Reformation in lands outside Germany. To the German-Swiss Egli and Finsler we owe the standard edition of Zwingli's works from 1895 onwards (continued by Köhler and Farner, *Corpus Ref.*). R. Stähelin of Basle has given us the standard biography of Zwingli, C. Stähelin the *Correspondence of Œcolampadius* (1927). Köhler has published the first volume of his standard work on Luther and Zwingli (1924). Wernle has devoted the second volume of his exposition of the evangelical faith, as contained in the principal writings of the Reformers, to Zwingli (1919). Calvin, the standard edition of whose works is also contained in the *Corpus Ref.*, has similarly been the subject of recent German or German-Swiss research. Witness the publications of Lang (1909), Barth's selection of his works, *Calvinstudien*, edited by Bohatec (1909), Anrich (1928), Quervain (1926). The study of Calvin's theology and political views has produced quite a crop of treatises. On his theology, Bauke (1922), Brummer (1925), Bechmann (1926), Friethoff (1926), Riesel (1928), Wernle (1919), Wolgendorff (1916), Bergerhaus (1910). On his political teaching, Haussherr (1923), Barm (1924), von Schubert (1923). Space permits only to mention examples of recent contributions to the Reformation History of some other lands—those of Wotschke on the Polish Reformation (1921), Arbusow for the Baltic lands

(1921), Makower and Lang for England, Doerries on Calvin and Lefèvre (*Z.K.G.*, 1925), K. Müller (' Calvin and the French Libertines,' *ib.* 1921).

In conclusion, I plead guilty to the omission, for the same reason, of many worthy contributions to the History of both the Ancient and the Reformation periods and apologize to the many scholars who have enriched the history of these periods by their researches. As a fellow-worker in this field who knows the exacting laboriousness of genuine historic research, and has derived much edification from the research of these scholars, I would add the expression of my appreciation of this unflagging labour, which reflects high honour on German scholarship and affords convincing proof of its distinguished ability and industry.

In the Study.

Virginibus Puerisque.

A Village Vow.

By Mrs. A. Threlfall Vickery, Prestwich, Manchester.

' Pay thy vows unto the Most High.'—Ps 50[14].

Some three hundred years ago there was vowed in a tiny village a solemn vow. It came through illness, and has been kept ever since. There had been war in Europe for a generation—the Thirty Years' War, your books of history call it—and after the war, in 1633, came pestilence, or plague, like our influenza, only worse. It spread like wildfire over Bavaria. But there was one village which escaped in a marvellous way; Oberammergau was its name. The villagers had kept most careful guard from the beginning; they let no outsiders come into their village, neither would they let their villagers go into other villages. But, at last, one man evaded the quarantine. He was a labourer of Oberammergau, working in a neighbouring village. He climbed the mountain passes, crept stealthily through the tracks, and, all unsuspected, came back to his own home. Poor Caspar Schuchler! He was desperately home-sick and longed to see his wife and children; he was terribly anxious about them, and wanted to make sure that they were not in need. Alas! he had come from a plague-stricken village, and he had plague upon him; in two days he was dead, and in thirty-three days threescore-and-ten people of his own village had died too!

The few who were left were filled with dread for the future. In their distress they prayed earnestly to God; they repented of their past sins, and they made a great vow—just as Jacob did, at Bethel.

Wasn't the vow a strange one? They promised that if God would remove that plague from them they would for ever afterwards hold a religious play, showing God's love to men, and that this Play should be shown every ten years. What happened? The plague ceased immediately, so the villagers, showing their sincerity, prepared to keep their vow, and they have kept it practically ever since.

The pastor of the village was a gifted man; he took the story of Christ's crucifixion, added a few scenes from the Old Testament, and then he set the villagers to work to perform this new Play. The custom was common in those days of performing Religious Plays, Miracle Plays, Nativity Plays, Passion Plays, much as we have Missionary Plays, Hospital Plays, Pageants, etc., nowadays, so the people were quite accustomed to that sort of thing. The pastor kept before them their vow. He made them feel that, in taking their parts, they were pleasing God, and he led them to put in their very best work, as an offering to God.

At first the Play was given in the churchyard, but that soon became too small to hold the crowds who wanted to see it. So a great theatre was built, with an open-air stage, and, as you watch the Play, the birds fly in and out, and you can see the mountains in the distance, and can hear the noise of tinkling cattle-bells and goat-bells in the street outside.

Who are the players? They are Oberammergau villagers, and are chosen by a committee of about twenty members. One takes the part of Christ; another of Mary, His mother; another Mary Magdalene; or Annas, Judas, or Peter. There are the crowds, too, the traders in the Temple, the crowd who shouted ' Hosanna!' and the crowd on the Crucifixion Day. Then there are the tableaux. These are Old Testament pictures, brought in to show how the Old Testament is linked to the New Testament. For instance, just before the scene where Judas sells Jesus for thirty pieces of silver, there is the tableau of Joseph being sold by his brethren. Sometimes there are more than a hundred people on the stage at the same time, and some of them are such tiny little children, only four or five years old. They must be perfectly still for two minutes, in the tableaux, not wriggling or laughing in the slightest! But even the tiniest children are taught that it is a great honour to be in the Passion Play, and they try to please God by their acting.

The actors do not use wigs or grease-paint or such stage aids. Men let their hair grow long, so that they may be like the pictures of Jesus and His disciples. If you were in Oberammergau, when the Play was not being held, you might see Simon or Mary going about the village, doing the usual work in the shop or the house. One might be the village sculptor, another the mother of some children, and you would know that they had been training for months past to carry out their parts perfectly. These actors are simple village people, but they take their work very seriously, and prepare for months ahead. It is splendid to think that they are observing the vow which their forefathers made, and are offering to God their skill and their art as a perpetual reminder of the deliverance from plague granted nearly three hundred years ago. In these days people sometimes grow careless about keeping promises. Let the Oberammergau Passion Players be an example to us!

A Noble Record-Breaker.

By the Reverend R. Oswald Davies, Leicester.

'They all won their record.'—He 11[9] (Moffatt).

We all regret the tragic, yet triumphant, death of Sir Henry Segrave. This gallant young man, at the early age of thirty-four, gave his life in the service of progress.

There are certain things about his achievements and character which we shall not easily forget. Let me mention a few of them.

1. First, *he lived a life that was not in vain.* When Sir Henry met his death on Lake Windermere in his attempt to beat the world's record in motor-boat racing, some people asked, 'Was it worth while?' They also said, 'What a foolish thing to do!'

The same things were said when he made his attempt to beat the world's record in motor-racing with the *Golden Arrow* at Daytona Beach, in Florida.

But was it for nothing that he took such tremendous risks? Think for a moment. Think of the wonderful motor-vehicles that travel our roads to-day, from baby-cars to the big saloons. How they glide along with perfect ease. But it was not always so. To travel in an old-fashioned 'bus or motor-car was like a veritable nightmare. It was a rickety, noisy affair, and you were always glad to get out of it. While to travel at high speed on water was simply impossible. To-day it is so different. And why? It is due to racing, both on land and water. By racing, men have found out the weaknesses and defects of cars and engines. In this way their high efficiency has been tested and improvements have been made possible. It is because of the gallant attempts of men like Sir Henry Segrave that we are able to travel on land and water with ease and comfort and with less danger of accident.

For this reason he did not live his short life in vain. When some deed that is worth while is being attempted it is often risky.

Men who have performed great deeds have taken great risks, and for this very reason their lives have not been in vain.

2. Again, *he was nobly unselfish.* After beating the world's motor-racing record just over a year ago with his *Golden Arrow* at the magnificent speed of 231 miles per hour, he said: 'In events of this kind, when they are successful, usually the driver gets all the praise. But,' he added, 'I want to say that I was helped tremendously to do what I did. I want to thank Captain Irving especially, who designed and perfected the *Golden Arrow* for me. *But for him I should have been absolutely nowhere.*'

Wasn't that really splendid?

Again, in his final attempt on Lake Windermere he made an unselfish gesture. He took with him in the boat Mr. Halliwell, the chief engineer, although it was not really necessary for Mr. Halliwell to accompany him. It was, however, his desire for his chief engineer to share the credit in his achievement. As some one has said: 'He would have been the first to insist that any honour gained by himself should be shared by Halliwell.' That was typical of him. When success came his way, he was not selfish about it. He didn't keep all the praise to himself. 'Others have helped me,' he would say, 'and I want to acknowledge them.'

Success is a fine thing, but it can be spoiled by selfishness. Whatever success may be your lot, never forget that you are debtors to others—to your fathers and mothers, your teachers, your ministers, and a host of others.

That great man Paul said that he owed everything in his life to Jesus.

3. Finally, *Sir Henry was not satisfied with past achievements.* One might think that having beaten the world's speed-record on land he would have been satisfied. Many a man would have rested on his laurels after such a magnificent achievement as that. On his return home he was graciously received by the King and was given the high honour of knighthood. But Sir Henry did not rest there.

He turned his attention to motor-boat racing—a far more dangerous occupation than even racing on land. He could not rest content while there were other records to be broken in other fields and other laurels to be won.

With *Miss England II.* he made his final attempt. It cost him his life, but he broke the world's record. His last words were: 'Have I broken the record?' Segrave was a noble record-breaker—a pioneer of Progress.

We, too, must not be satisfied with past achievements, however good they may be. We must go forward seeking greater achievements in higher realms. The best is ever before us. 'Be ye, therefore, perfect,' said Jesus, 'as your Father which is in heaven is perfect.' We must not rest on our laurels while there are others to be won.

The eleventh chapter of the Epistle to the Hebrews is a Roll of Honour of some of the heroes of the past, all of whom were record-breakers. They all won their record for Faith, and there can be no nobler record than that.

The Christian Year.

TENTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

The Fulness of Joy.

'His presence is salvation.'—Ps 42[5] (marg.).
'In thy presence is fulness of joy.'—Ps 16[11].

To be in any man's presence is to be near him. It is to be in the same room with him. It is to see him and to hear him. And it is that he should see and hear us. But God's presence is not like that. God's presence is not to be sought for in any one time, or in any place, like a man's presence. God Almighty does not dwell within the limits of time and space as He has made man to dwell. 'God is a Spirit, infinite, eternal, and unchangeable.' And, if He has a presence-chamber anywhere at all, let Him describe His presence-chamber to us Himself. 'For thus saith the High and lofty One that inhabiteth eternity, whose name is Holy: I dwell in the high and holy place, with him also that is of a contrite and humble spirit, to revive the spirit of the humble, and to revive the heart of the contrite ones.' We shall never, to all eternity, fully understand the metaphysical presence of God, but even now and here we shall all enjoy His gracious presence and the light of His countenance, so far as we are of a humble and a contrite heart.

At the same time, absolutely impossible as it is for us at all to comprehend the bottomless mystery of the Divine Omnipresence, we cannot employ our minds better than by dazzling them and staggering them with such thoughts as these: *Deus ubique est: et totus ubique est*; that is to say, God is everywhere, and He is wholly everywhere. Just to take that first principle of the Divine Nature and to dwell upon it and to call it up continually in our minds, and to enter, as far as may be, into it, and to feed our souls upon it, and to take a majestic joy out of it—to what more blessed use can we put our best minds and all that is within us. And again, to take this: that in God all things live and move, and have their being: absolutely all things—from a grain of sand up to a solar system, and from a coral insect up to an archangel.

There is a little finger-length of a book entitled *Brother Lawrence on the Practice of the Presence of God.* Let us proceed to learn one or two lessons in that holiest and most blessed of all practices.

(1) And to begin with, let us 'practise the presence of God' by a firm faith in God, and a firm faith in His presence. God and His presence will come to be almost an object of sense to us, almost a matter of sight and touch to us, if we sufficiently practise it. But for a long time it must be a practice of pure faith. We do not need faith to practise the presence of any of our fellow-creatures. We can see them. But not God. No man with his eyes hath seen God at any time. And thus it is that 'he that cometh to God must believe that he is.' His faith must be, as it were, the 'substance' of his God to him. His faith must be to him the 'evidence' of his God's very existence to him, as the Apostle so nobly and so boldly has it—so much so, that faith, as it were, creates her God and sustains his ideal. God lives, and moves, and has His being, so to say, in His people's faith in Him. He is: He eternally and absolutely is, apart altogether from them and from their faith in Him. But it is their faith in Him that makes Him to be for them. 'Be it unto you,' our Lord was constantly saying, 'according to your faith.' He might have instituted some other principle for His

purpose than faith, but it did not seem good to Him to do so. And thus it is, that from beginning to end of the Christian life, and from centre to circumference, it is faith first, faith last, faith always, faith everywhere. And nowhere more than just here and in the practice of the presence of God. Practise faith, then, upon the presence of God, and that will give God a nearness to you and a reality to you and a power over you that nothing else can do.

(2) It is a very noble and ennobling practice that some men have of connecting God's presence with all His work in Nature and in providence as well as in grace. We like our work to be recognized and appreciated; and in this God has made us in His own image. It was one of His bitterest charges against Israel in Isaiah's day that they did not 'consider' Him. On the other hand, 'He maketh his sun to shine,' said our Lord, as often as He looked up into the summer sky. And within—William Law used to take his stand at his eastern window till the sun began to climb up into the morning sky, when he saluted his fellow-servant in these and like terms: 'Glorious creature,' he exclaimed, 'of the glorious Creator, come and let us serve and obey Him for another day, according to His ordinances.'

And then from Nature and from God's presence in Nature we will rise to practise His presence in His ever-loving and never-sleeping providence; in past history and in everyday history, in His daily newspapers as well as His inspired Word; and from that onwards and inwards to His daily and homely momentary providence of all kinds in our own life.

(3) The prophets and the psalmists of Israel made such splendid practice of this presence of the pure and absolute Godhead in their day, that, what they would have attained to, had they lived in our New Testament day, it is difficult to imagine. For how easy, and how pleasant, and how attractive, and how heart-winning it is to practise the presence of God in Christ. Are we practising the presence of God in act? Let us begin to do it in this simple and sincere way. Practise our presence back beside His presence. Practise our presence all up and down the four Gospels. Our presence at His baptism, at His temptation in the wilderness, at this sermon of His and that, also this miracle of His and that, when He is healing a leper, practising His part, and possess ourselves of the experience of that unclean creature. When He is forgiving sins, practise being the forgiven sinner. Practise, in that way, every time we open the four Gospels; and we will open them more than all other books in the world, taken together, and with good reason. And then from that, go on to practise His presence in it risen and glorified, understanding all the time that no small part of His glorification stands in His power and His will to be with us by His Divine presence and by His human sympathy, in ways and to results past all our understanding, but only the more sure to our experience. Let us practise His risen presence in our personal life, in our hours at home, in our secret heart. Let us see Him standing over us and inclining His ear towards us in our most secret hour of prayer. See Him sitting over against us when we sit down to do our work. Practise a fast faith in Him in all our trials and in all our crooked crosses.

Let us lay down this law to ourselves—that nothing comes to us of any kind without His permission, and we will soon be the men of the most serene and most self-possessed hearts. So, let us practise His presence, both in Scripture, and still more in our own hearts and lives, till if He were to come into our house to-night and in the body, we would feel at once at home with Him and He with us.

And now, just one quotation, by way of acknowledgment to Brother Lawrence for his inspiration. 'He had found such an advantage in living in this presence of God that it was natural for him to recommend it earnestly to others. But his example was a stronger inducement than any argument he could propose. His very countenance was edifying; such a sweet and calm devotion appearing in it as could not but affect the beholder. And it was observed, that in the greatest hurry of business in his kitchen (for he was cook to the society), he still preserved his recollection and his heavenly-mindedness. He was never hasty, nor loitering, but did each thing in its season, with an even, uninterrupted composure and tranquillity of mind. "The time of business," said he, "does not with me differ from the time of prayer, and in the noise and clatter of the kitchen I possess God in as great tranquillity as if I were upon my knees before the Blessed Sacrament."'[1]

ELEVENTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

Immortality and Common Sense.

'This mortal must put on immortality.'—1 Co 15^{53}.

Were St. Paul alive to-day would he still put it like that, or would he not rather put it: Immortality must put off this mortal? The real truth about us is not that we grow into immortality, but that we grow out of mortality. We find ourselves always coming back to this subject; and justly, because Jesus defines Himself in terms of it: 'I am come that they might have life, and have it more abundantly.' Supremely, in His own terms, He is the life-giver, or more exactly, perhaps, the life-revealer; for 'life and immortality are *brought to light* in the gospel.' He is Saviour because sin is the chief obstacle in the way of life. If we were not immortal it would not have been worth Christ's while to die for us. What is the good of saving dust from judgment? Really to believe in Christ is to believe that Christ's death for man implies man's immortality.

---

[1] A. Whyte, *The Nature of Angels*, 199.

Our present body is not what it is merely intrinsically. It cannot be considered except in conjunction with this particular earth on which we live. It takes its qualities from this world in which we live, as much as from ourselves. There was an article in a scientific magazine the other day about one of the heavenly bodies—to be precise, the satellite of Sirius—which is of such an extraordinary density (ten thousand times the density of the earth), that if we lived there instead of on this planet, each of us would weigh about a thousand tons. In other words, the whole condition and constitution of life would be entirely changed for us by a mere change of the density of the globe on which we lived.

What does this mean? Surely that life is always adjusted to environment, or that environment is always adjusted to life. And that is the key to the survival of death, and the next world. Our trouble about it is precisely that it is going to upset all our values: we don't really want it because we imagine, we fear, that we are going to be entirely different persons there. These eyes that see sunsets and hail the dawn; these lungs that delight in the breath of the sweet air; these hands that grasp things that are real; these hearts that love other living hearts,—how are they going to fare under totally different conditions? Shadows and phantoms have no attraction for us: the whole thing is clothed in unreality.

But the 'real' for us is a mere matter of adjustment to our conditions. The heavenly life is just as real—as tangible—as this. It is a condition of all life. The birds of to-day's air evolved from the fishes whose element was the sea, millions of years ago. Precisely the same principle of life persists, but the new organism has adjusted itself perfectly to the new environment.

So when we get to the next world, so completely will we be adjusted to our new conditions that it will all seem just as real and as natural and inevitable as this world; and we will no more regret this world than the lark or the eagle regrets the sea, in which its remote ancestors lived. It is precisely this delusion about unreality that makes many people indifferent to—even half afraid of—the next world.

The trouble about immortality in the past has been that while it has been a postulate of faith, it has often failed to clarify and vindicate itself to reason. Reason has failed to see—or theology (especially in its revolt from the dogma of the resurrection of the flesh) has failed to make it clear to reason that

Eternal form shall still divide
Eternal soul from all beside.

Many people are less afraid of death as extinction, than they are afraid of death as the portal of the unknown and the unreal. They are afraid of life under unknown conditions. They might welcome 'sleep,' but they are afraid it won't be sleep: they are afraid of waking up—themselves—in conditions of fantastic unreality, in which they can no longer be themselves. And so we have the strong persuasion that if Jesus Himself had been writing these words of St. Paul's, He would have put them the other way round. He would have said that when we die it is not the mortal putting on immortality, but 'immortality putting off the mortal'—the essential 'I' adjusting itself to conditions as entirely real and natural to our new progress as those we have left behind.

Immortality is not fundamentally a matter of figures and calculations, even of history or faith. It is fundamentally a problem of ourselves. Anything and everything we *may* be is founded on *what we are*. That is why Christ never proved it, and said very little about the Beyond, and spent almost all His time and energy on the present; on getting people to understand themselves, and to believe *in Him*. Not in theories about Him, but in Him—what He was. For you will never really want to be anything Beyond, until you are very sure what you are now. That is the problem. 'The relationship,' says Dr. Fosdick, in an article in *Harper's Magazine*, 'between those nine billion brain cells with which we do our thinking on the one side, and on the other our personalities, our thoughts, ideals, purposes, loves, and all the expanding possibilities of our characters, is the most baffling problem in the universe. The merely *physical* explanation of ourselves becomes the more difficult the farther one goes into it. For suppose some instrument so ingenious that looking through it one could see the brain cells of a man at work. Then suppose that some mirror could make the instrument introspective, so that a man could watch his own brain cells at work. It would be a curious experience. *For who would be doing the watching?*' Unless you are prepared to assume that the brain cells are watching themselves, the materialist position becomes impossible. 'Some modern chemists,' Dr. Fosdick goes on to tell us, 'have been analysing the average man and have put into picturesque terms what he is made of: enough fat to make seven bars of soap; enough iron to make one nail of medium size; enough sugar to fill a shaker; enough lime to whitewash a chicken-coop; enough phosphorus to make twenty-two hundred match-tips; enough magnesium for one good dose of magnesia; enough potassium to explode a toy cannon; a pinch of sulphur. And they say that the market value of these chemicals is about four shillings.'

The first question is not what this may become, but what it is now. 'Does any one honestly think,' Dr. Fosdick goes on, 'that a few chemical elements, worth about two shillings and sixpence a hundredweight, cleverly organised by Nature, ignorant of what she was doing, has resulted in our Isaiahs and Platos, our Galileos and Darwins, and — forgive the irreverence — in Jesus Christ Himself?' If we don't believe it we must be prepared to accept the alternative: and there is only one alternative. And that is that matter does not explain spirit, and that spirit is independent of matter. Or, in other words, that the immortal *can* put off mortality.

There can be no worse hell for some men than knowing what they have become in the light of what they really are: the seeing—when these mortal eyes have ceased to veil reality—of what they have done with their immortality. The picture of Christ the terrible judge of mediæval theology has never seemed to be clothed with any persuasive reality. His sorrow is more to be dreaded than His rebuke. His 'depart from me' more to be feared than the sentence of hell. As Newman has it in the *Dream of Gerontius*:

> And these two pains, so counter and so keen,
> The longing for Him, when thou seest Him not;
> The shame of self at thought of seeing Him,
> Will be thy veriest, sharpest purgatory.

God's laws do not break down in that other world; the great principles which govern life here, govern life everywhere; and the larger immortal life there will be a perfect and wholly natural and inevitable mutual adjustment of environment and life. But a man cannot neglect his immortality now and not pay the price then. The 'outer darkness' of one of His parables—cleansed of its mediæval accretions—rendered simply as the darkness which is outside God, the darkness of separation from God—is a very real and terrible thing.

Of 'sins' Christ spoke often, but always in terms that suggested that He could deal with them summarily and authoritatively. 'Thy sins are forgiven thee.' But He only spoke of 'sin' in one definite and decisive connexion: 'If I had not come, they had not known *sin*; but now they have no excuse for their sin.' And what is sin? 'Of sin because they believe not on me.' And who is He? 'In him was life.' 'Ye will not come unto me that ye might have life'—their own life. We may be scarred, tempest-tossed, beaten, and fallen, but if we never let go of Life, of Him who is the Life, He will never let us go; and He will hold us, cleanse us, save us though as by fire.[1]

TWELFTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

The Unpurchasable Things of Life.

'And he said unto her, Because I spake unto Naboth the Jezreelite, and said unto him, Give me thy vineyard for money; or else, if it please thee, I will give thee another vineyard for it: and he answered, I will not give thee my vineyard.'—1 K 21[6].

To give Ahab his due, he never intended to go the length he did when first he cast envious and longing eyes upon Naboth's little vineyard. He wished Naboth no harm; indeed, in other circumstances he might have been glad to advance the worthy man's interests. But unfortunately those interests happened to clash with the schemes for expansion which the powerful monarch had under contemplation. That little bit of land bordered upon his own wide demesne, and was the most convenient outlet for the plans he was evolving; and to invade it at all costs he was determined.

It was no mere sentiment which dictated Naboth's determined refusal of the tyrant's request. And this Ahab knew, or should have known. Canaan was to every Israelite in a peculiar manner God's land. They considered themselves His tenants; and this was one of the conditions of their leases, that they should not alienate any part of that which fell to their lot, unless in case of extreme necessity.

---

[1] H. E. Brierley, *Life Indeed*, 52.

Somehow or other Ahab must circumvent the other's squeamish conscience. He has evidently no thought of violating by force the other's ground; but he will buy him out if he can. What will Naboth take to let the imperious monarch pursue unchecked his schemes of aggrandizement? Will he take the full value in cash of the invaded land, or will he accept a better vineyard in exchange? Bribes, entreaties, threats—all are unavailing. Ahab did not know his man.

The sequel is interesting, and withal strangely familiar. Ahab's evil genius at his side prompts him to throw honour and all moral and religious considerations to the winds, and work his will. 'What is the use of having might if you do not exercise it?' she whispered. 'Dost thou now govern Israel?' And down the tyrant goes and takes possession by the power of the sword. The deed is shameful and barefaced enough in itself, but the accompanying circumstances of its committal make it worse. For in the process there is a travesty of law, a mockery of religion, and a revolting show of regard for justice and righteousness.

In one of the most dramatic scenes in the Old Testament, Elijah, the man of God, encounters Ahab at the very height of his seeming triumph. And Ahab's face grew pale, and the spirit shrivelled within him, like a tendril of one of the stolen vines at the scorching breath of the desert wind.

Naboth paid the price of honour and loyalty and religious conviction in full, as it has been paid in the same ruddy coin many a time since then. The stand that he made was not for himself alone, but for posterity. And his action stands for all time as testimony to the truth that there are some things in life that are unpurchasable. It is not its rental in broad acres that makes a man willing to shed the last drop of his blood in defence of his country. No doubt the market price of it might be weighed to the seller, or some fairer corner of the earth be had in exchange for it. It is because it is the 'inheritance of his fathers' that makes it without price in his sight. 'I will give thee another vineyard for it'—the very suggestion is insulting. Other soil may be more fertile, but none is so sacred. The isles of Greece may be small; but a blind old man wandered among them telling his deathless stories, and so they live. Scottish soil may be hard to turn; but there was a ploughman who drew one furrow whence an unending harvest of inspiration is reaped, and he that bindeth sheaves filleth his bosom. 'I will give thee the worth of it in money.' No, Ahab simply did not know what he was saying when he made his insulting proposal to Naboth.

Not one of the gifts of God may be purchased with money—not honour, not love, not peace of conscience, not even the respect of our fellow-men. 'If a man would give all the substance of his house for love it would utterly be contemned.' You buy a book, but there is something in the book that you cannot buy. You may handle in pride of possession the material form and substance of your purchase, but not the book of the poet or the thinker. There is something here which you may never be able to call your own, and that is the priceless thing about the book. So of the salvation of God in Christ, so of high thoughts and sympathy, and happiness and peace, and the visions of faith and hope; they all are gifts—unspeakable and unpurchasable gifts.

What made Naboth so stout in the defence of his little vineyard, so brave in his defiance of the thieving tyrant? Had he ever sold something of value, and learned only after he had parted with it what its true worth was? And had he vowed that not even gold from the royal treasury should ever tempt him to part with that which remained? At any rate, he had come to see that not even life itself was worth the keeping if he parted with the little vineyard.

In one of its most devilishly cynical phrases the world roundly declares and believes that 'Every man has his price.' It may be so; but there have been those who have made theirs prohibitive—to the glory of God and the confounding of Ahab. There are always the two points of view, that of Ahab and that of Naboth. The one cannot understand the other's jealous guardianship of that which seems so small and insignificant. Why not part with honour, or with innocence, or with that ideal? 'I will give thee the worth of it in money.' Why make that pig-headed stand for the religious and moral standards of the fathers?

Oh, Ahab is a specious pleader as well as a powerful monarch. Do not think that Naboth did not feel the force of the temptation. Most powerfully *He* felt it, He our Naboth, who defended for us the vineyard of our inheritance, the wine of the unpurchasable sacrament. For a mightier than Ahab showed Him all the kingdoms of the world in a moment of time: 'All these will I give thee if——' But He would not. And they brought against Him also men, sons of Belial; and Him, too, they carried forth out of the city, and with a mockery of justice they brought Him in the end to death. But the Prince of Darkness did not get the vineyard.

Don't sell it to him now. You have parted with much, perhaps, much whose unpurchasable worth you realized too late. Keep the wine of the priceless vintage to the last. There is no man who does not feel the force of that seductive voice, 'Give me thy vineyard, that I may have it for a garden of herbs, because it is near unto my house.' As if that were any excuse! Because sin is specious and access easy for the devil, that therefore we should surrender at will!

It is just part of the arrogant blindness of Ahab that he can never see the value of that with which he would have us part so lightly. It was not for nothing that the fathers defended and handed down the little quiet spaces where the spirit walks with God. Those things that we refuse to sell—the little vineyards upon which the world deems that so ready a price may be put, we defend them not for the memory of the fathers alone, nor yet for the slaking of our own souls' thirst, but because we have a duty and a high responsibility to the generations yet unborn.[1]

THIRTEENTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

I know in Part.

'Now I know in part; but then shall I know even as also I am known.'—1 Co 13[12].

St. Paul did not profess to know everything. In regard to many things of vast import he had honestly to admit that he did not know.

There was a time in the life of St. Paul when he knew much more than he did when he wrote this Hymn of Love; a time when he knew more and loved less. Like some of the rest of us, he had been trained in a system of theology in which little was left unknown. His teachers knew the nature of God, the names and number of the angels, and the end of all things. As often happens, his knowledge made him narrow, bigoted, and intolerant, as if it were not sure of itself.

Much depends upon the tone of voice and heart in which we say that we do not know. It may be said in a tone of sad finality, if not dogmatic denial, implying that there is nothing to know. Such an attitude was alien to the mind of St. Paul, who was neither negative nor neutral, as so many are to-day. The issues involved were too profound, too far-reaching. One cannot think of St. Paul singing the plaintive minor music of our time, half query and half protest. Never! His music was akin to that high, heroic, lonely voice echoing across the ages, 'I know that my Redeemer liveth,' flinging out his faith in the teeth of tragedy. As he himself said elsewhere, 'I know whom I have believed, and am persuaded that he is able to keep that which I have deposited with him.' In other words, he thought expectantly, as one who knew that there is always truth ahead, more truth to be known, truth more wonderful than we have yet imagined. Such should be our attitude to-day, in the midst of the extraordinary advance of knowledge.

1. Here we are in an amazing universe, alive, active, thinking, dreaming, loving, seeking to know the meaning of the world and our place and duty in it. Manifestly, then, if there is any key to the riddle it must be found in something within ourselves, since we cannot leap outside ourselves to discover it. Nor do we need to do so, because we are within Nature, not opposed to it, but a part of it; and this means that in values, as in consciousness, we are on the inside, and have, in our own nature, a clue to its meaning. Nay, more; we are agents, actors, participants in the actual life of the universe, not mere spectators of reality, but part of it.

By the same token, if there is a spiritual element in man, which no one denies, it must have come from the universe itself, if not from physical nature, then from some Power behind and within physical nature, else it would not be in man. Also, the spiritual quality, so to name it, must be greater in the universe than in man, since its development in man is still so incomplete. Here, truly, is a firm basis of faith, built into the very structure of our being, and *the first fact upon which we build is the moral sense in man*. Here it is, rooted in the very bottom of our being, interpret it as we like—an impulse, an insight, an inner censor, an awful whisper of command—as much a part of the universe as pig-iron or potash; something which has never accepted utter identification with outer force or brute fact. At the core of consciousness is conscience, a sense of right and wrong, an inexorable demand for obedience to an inner law. Like everything else, it may vary with race, custom, depth of insight, and degree of development, but it is a fact of Nature and life.

The two overwhelming mysteries, as Kant said, are the still depth of a starlit sky and the silent whisper of the moral law in the soul of man; and one is as real as the other. Explain the moral life of man how we will, describe it as an infantile inhibition of humanity, as the fashion now is, declare it to be only an echo within us of an old ancestral memory, or the shadow of an ancient fear—that is only to push the mystery farther back and deeper down. The origin of the moral life, the initial bias toward righteousness remain to be accounted for. It is here within us, unaccountably. We did not create it. Whether we can destroy it or not, we do not know. When we obey it, we are happy; when we disobey it, we are thwarting our own nature and defying the law of our very being. To explain it away is not to send it away.

---

[1] H. L. Simpson, *Put Forth by the Moon*, 144.

Upon this fact, then, we may build, as Robertson did when, as a young man, sorely troubled about his faith and the meaning of his life, he went to the Alps to fight it out. The only thing which the analysis could not dissolve and destroy was the moral law within, and so, 'clinging obstinately to moral good,' in spite of himself, he built upon that firm basis the edifice of his faith.

2. The second thing that we know is no less sure; it is *that we have the power to choose what is right and to refuse what is wrong*, or, contrariwise, to choose the wrong and refuse the right. Having done both, we know that it is true. At once we are faced by a vague fatalistic philosophy now in vogue, albeit hoary with age, which tells us that we are no more responsible for what we do than we are for the shape of our heads and the colour of our eyes. No doubt it is plausible and many facts may be arrayed in its behalf; but every man knows that it is false. When Dr. Johnson had heard all the facts in favour of fatalism, he brought his old cane down with a thump, and said, 'I know I am free, and that is the end of it.'

Fate is a fact, and so is freedom. Much of our life is ordered for us by fate, and runs in grooves which it must follow; most of it is fixed before we arrive. Still, limitation has its limits, and it is the fate of man to be free. Hedged about, restricted, enmeshed in a network of laws, his liberty is none the less real because it is limited, as it must be of necessity by the fact that he is finite, as well as by the nature and purpose of his life.

Just the same, as Tennyson said, 'If we are birds in a cage, we decide whether we are to sit on the upper perch or the lower.' If Fate is supreme, then there must be a Higher Fatalism which includes moral law and the quest of truth, obedience to which sets us free. Or perhaps we may say that the will of man is free in that it is not *compelled*, but limited in the sense that it is *impelled* by the law of its own being, as well as by the pervasive and ultimately persuasive influence of the good which is stronger than evil.

3. Even the moral life, with its awful law and its perilous liberty, is not all that we find within these 'little infinite human souls.' There is something else; something elusive, ineluctable, irresistible, unconscious oft, unsatisfied ever; something free and flaming—*a motion and a passion that run beyond duty, beyond righteousness, in quest of goodness.*

No one can define religion; it breaks through all language and escapes. At once a mystery and a madness, no one can tell what it will do or become next, except that it will do some impossible thing and talk about it in parables. One day it gives us a militarist like Cromwell, the next a pacifist like Tolstoy or Ghandi. It turns Fra Angelico to art, and the Puritans against art. In one age it created the drama, and in the next prohibited it. It fashions a stately Roman procession and a quaint Quaker bonnet; the Gothic glory of a cathedral—its tower a nesting-place of dreams—and the drabness of a country meeting-house.

4. There is another thing that we know: both *our moral sense and our religious nature*—shy, lonely, wistful, adventurous—*find fulfilment and satisfaction in the life, personality, and character of Jesus*, as nowhere else. Some one asked Bertrand Russell two questions: 'Do you fully understand the Einstein theory of relativity? and do you go with him all the way?' Quick as a flash the great mathematician replied: 'I answer the first question in the negative, and the second in the affirmative.' That is exactly our attitude toward Jesus. He baffles our mind, but He searches our heart and sways it as no one else can do. His tragic Figure of heroic moral loveliness subdues us, chastens us, challenges us, redeems us. To us Jesus is a dream come true, a vision verified, the lost, ineffable Word made flesh, and then spirit again; the Life that interprets life, revealing a tender love hidden in a terrible mystery.

5. One other thing we know, too, beyond the shadow of doubt or cavil: *soon or late we must obey the vision of moral power and spiritual beauty we have seen in Jesus—we can never be happy until we do.* But, if we needs must follow the highest when we see it, we must have help for the adventure, and we can get it. This, too, we know with an assurance made doubly sure by the testing of time and trial. The Church, in spite of its faults and failings, is a profound help. The Church is 'a society for the promotion of goodness in the world,' as Arnold said, and to unite in an historic fellowship of men seeking goodness is both an inspiration and a consecration. It is like climbers of the Alps, who tie themselves together, so that if one slip all hold him up.

The Bible is a help, too, though, alas, it is so little known and used by those who would love it best if they sought its counsel. Also, there is help for all who ask for it in prayer. Whether we call it fellowship with God or adjustment to the universe, it deals directly with reality, wherein, as Dante told us, lies our peace. Of all forms of human effort, prayer is the most profoundly practical, if we add the will to listen and work for its answer. One reads the life of St. Teresa with mingled awe and joy, remembering the eighteen years she devoted to the mastery of this highest of all arts.

These things we know beyond a doubt, and upon them we build a working faith for to-day and a singing hope for the morrow. Moral law and liberty, the sense of the Infinite in the finite, the fascination and challenge of the life of Jesus, and what the Prayer Book calls 'the means of grace'—life cannot be ignoble or worthless when it gives us such guidance in a world where there is truth to seek, love to win, work to do, and beauty to adore.[1]

Fourteenth Sunday after Trinity.

HARVEST SERMON.

First-fruits and Last Fruits.[2]

'Thou shalt take of the first of all the fruit of the ground, which thou shalt bring in from thy land . . . and set it down before the altar of the Lord thy God.'—Dt 26$^{2 \cdot 4}$ (R.V.).

The earth yielding her increase is a great mystery. In all ages it has stirred imagination and wonder and joy. Harvest festivals of some sort are as old as man the agriculturist. There is no little interest in getting to know how other peoples have kept harvest. The Jews had their own festivals. For them there was hardly any joy like the joy of harvest.

That interesting old book of laws—Deuteronomy, has preserved some of the old regulations and customs that belonged to harvest. The reaping had neither to be without thought of God, nor without thought of others. The first-fruits had to be given to God. 'Thou shalt take of the first of all the fruit of the ground, which thou shalt bring in from thy land, and set it down before the altar of the Lord thy God.' It was in the nature of a thank offering, and the custom goes much farther back than the Jews. It was an old Semitic custom, and until it had been observed, the rest of the crop was not regarded as lawful food.

There were old superstitions about it being *unsafe* to eat of new crops until the gods had received their share. Amongst the Jews the amount to be presented seems to have been left to the discretion of the offerer. It must have been a picturesque thing in later days to see the procession of such offerers coming into Jerusalem, with their wreathed baskets on their shoulders, to present them in the Temple courts, to the accompaniment of music and song.

As they handed gifts over to the priest, they had to repeat, what at first sight seems a curious formula—far removed from the thought of harvest—'A Syrian ready to perish was my father, and he went down into Egypt and sojourned there.' Then came a reference to the captivity and the deliverance and the ultimate entrance into the land of Promise. The Jew is to remember that things were not always thus with Israel. He is to cast his eyes over the generations until he sees a family of nomads, a wandering clan, who gathered no harvests, but lived from hand to mouth. Behind the harvest, he was to remember a history and a human pilgrimage—in the hope that the remembrance would stir the sense of wonder and gratitude. From gathered wheat and barley, grapes and figs, and olives and honey, the thought leaps to 'old unhappy far-off things, and battles long ago.' The possibility of a harvest was rooted in far-off heroisms. It was because some one had once gone out, not knowing whither he went, to whom Canaan was a land of dreams, that to a later age it had become a homeland.

In the hour of rewarded toil, the Israelite was to remember that he was reaping, not only his own sowing, but the sowings of past ages, in the way of daring faith and sacrifice. We might not have thought of that in connexion with harvest, but those old legislators did. The rule reveals a fine insight into the deeper significance of life. In this old custom we see one of the noblest uses to which history can be put, namely, to stir moods of wonder and gratitude, the sense of obligation to the heroisms of the past, the remembrance that others laboured and we have entered into their labours. The formula may with many have become a form, a remembrance in word rather than in thought. But in so far as the offerers entered into the spirit of that remembrance, they would the more richly and joyously enter into the occasion of the first-fruits. For giving can itself be a joy and an enrichment of the spirit.

---

[1] J. F. Newton, *Things I know in Religion*, 7.

[2] By the Rev. F. C. Hoggarth, Great Horton, Bradford.

Though the amount of the offering was left to the individual, there was an expectation as to quality. There is rather a fine gesture in the idea of first-fruits. A man did not say that anything would do. It was expected he would have a pride in his offering—bringing the first-fruits of the ground and the fattest lamb of the flock. There is not a little help in an expectation of that kind, and the stronger it can be made the better. For there is often a tendency and a temptation to offer to God that in which no pride could be taken. Lest the temptation should be too great, the Hebrew put a barrier against it in his law. But the proper place for such a barrier is in the heart. The days have probably gone by when the support of religion could be made compulsory. Yet freedom should not be an excuse for selfishness. It is thought by some that in the gift of first-fruit is to be found the origin of the tithe. In any case, for the Jew the support of worship and of religion was not a casual charge. As far as the law could, it saw that people's gifts to religion were adequate and regular. Conditions have changed—and voluntary systems are now in vogue. It has been truly said that not the least condemnation of many Christians are the ways to which churches are driven to raise money.

There is no end of Christians who no longer 'give' to the Church—they only pay. The condition of their support is that they get a tea or a concert in return. There is no opening of the hand, no stirring of great emotions, no sense of deep obligations, or of the importance of the Church and all it stands for in the life of the nation.

If the Hebrew gave his first-fruits to God, he gave his last fruits to the poor and needy. In the same book of laws, Deuteronomy, there is a number of ancient harvest regulations, drawn up in a spirit of brotherhood. 'When thou reapest thine harvest and hast forgot a sheaf in the field, thou shalt not go again to fetch it.' 'When thou beatest thine olive tree, thou shalt not go over the boughs again.' 'When thou gatherest the grapes of thy vineyard, thou shalt not glean after it.' The residue in all these cases was to be for the stranger, the fatherless, the widow. The law is not permissive, but imperative. Its terms are 'thou shalt.' Given no spirit of brotherhood, the law doubtless could be evaded, though observed in the letter. If the law forbids you to go over your boughs a second time, and if you do not want those in need to share somewhat with you in the generosities of Nature, obviously one could go over the boughs with double thoroughness the first time.

The intention was that the Jew at harvest-time should not only recognize his ties with the past, but also with the present. He was bound up in one bundle of life with his needy contemporaries—the widow, the stranger, the fatherless—that is, those for whom life's provisions and protections were inadequate, through misfortune or loss, or the accident of birth or circumstance. Such had a claim for consideration, a right to glean in the fields of the prosperous. We see the gleaners at work in that lovely idyll, the Book of Ruth. There were times evidently when it had a romance all its own!

In former days in England, a labourer's children would be kept from school to glean. They rose at 4 a.m., carrying a bag in front of them for the short ears, those without straw. When enough of the longer ones had been gathered, they were tied in bundles and left in the stubble, and the gleaners knew their own.

The year's rent was sometimes made in this way. Gleaning has died out with the advent of the self-binder mowing machines.

In the old days in Israel, every harvest field and vine and olive tree proclaimed the truth of neighbourliness and charity. There was in the law of the land a check against the acquisitive spirit that would have all. 'Business is business,' we say. Here in the midst of the harvest field was a human touch which suggested charity rather than business. That sheaf in the field and those ungathered olives and grapes are symbolic of a far-reaching principle that still needs to be incorporated into life, however different the expression of it may be. Such succour and kindly aid is more than a private matter. For instance, there is the recognition that no one in our midst must starve. More and more has corporate responsibility for the unfortunate and the handicapped been recognized. There are many gracious and beautiful social services carried on under the ægis of a modern city. Canon Barnett of Toynbee Hall, who knew as intimately as any man the needs and problems of the East End of London, said there was need for a new beatitude. 'Blessed are the tax-payers.' It takes the sting out of some of them to know they are acceptable unto God. In this case God loves a cheerful tax-payer. It is a form of giving; and the tax-collector helps some to do good with their money, who might otherwise forget. 'Inasmuch as ye did it unto one of the least of these,' through rates or taxes, 'ye did it unto me.'

That is not an argument for squandering money, especially other people's money. It does not follow because taxes and rates are high that the right things are necessarily being most effectively or most economically done. What is needed is reappropriation, not increase; less on war, for instance, and more on things like health and education. Safeguards should be taken against abuse. Other humane services depend on voluntary gifts. They are one of the splendid aspects of our age. Never was there in any age such a variety and multiplicity of service for the handicapped and unfortunate. Their maintenance depends on the development of a high sense of responsibility, remembering the right of the less privileged to glean in the harvest fields of our lives.

Recent Foreign Theology.

The Kingdom of God and the Church in the New Testament.

When in the latter part of last century the social problem was forced on the attention of the Christian Church, and some advanced thinkers began to realize the social applications of the Christian gospel, the term, *The Kingdom of God*, so common in the Gospels, and yet so largely neglected in Christian theology, was revived as the standard around which these new interests might be gathered. The ardent champions of this revival did not pause to ask themselves whether their interpretation of the term was the same as the intention of Jesus. Some of the social reformers from Great Britain and America were not a little disconcerted to find that their use of the term was challenged by the German scholars at the Stockholm Conference. To their confident conviction that the Kingdom of God might be advanced and hastened on earth by human endeavour, there was opposed the charge of an optimism and an activism, inconsistent with that humble sense of man's insufficiency and that submissive dependence on God's sole sufficiency which was put forward as the distinctively Christian piety by the Lutheran speakers. For them the Kingdom of God meant a transcendent, catastrophic Divine intervention in human history, and not an evolutionary human moral and religious progress. The eschatological school of critics gave to this exclusive interpretation the authority of Jesus Himself. While mutual intercourse may have done something to modify the opposition, the contrast of conception still remains. It is in the circumstances an interesting and important contribution to the treatment of this question which is offered in the volume before us.[1]

For thoroughness of treatment, orderliness of arrangement, clearness of exposition, and, in my judgment, persuasiveness of reasoning, it would not be easy to find a match to this volume; and the author has deserved well for what must have been an immense labour, but evidently a labour of love. As one might have expected, he goes to the very roots of the question.

In the first part he discusses the royal rule (*Königsherrschaft*) of God. In the first section here there is an historical survey of the Old Testament; the second deals with the fundamental character of the New Testament proclamation of the rule; what is emphasized is its dynamic character. God is constantly, supremely active. 'Jesus' deed is God's deed, that means nothing else than that His person is inseparable from His work.' 'Jesus no more *teaches* about the Kingdom, but He *brings* it in His Messianic dealing actually into the present, as well with His doing as with His word, which above all is the creative principle of His total activity.' . . . 'Only one Messianic figure remained open to Him for realization, that of the Servant and the Son of Man Messiah of Deutero-Isaiah, and of Daniel' (pp. 61–62). This conception of the Divine rule gives consistency to the New Testament representations. In the following sections the characteristics of the kingly activity of God are very fully discussed. (*a*) It is *above time*: linked as it is to Jesus' conception of God, it leads us to set aside evolutionism and synergism. 'The Divine rule,' he maintains, 'is nowhere thought as a developing one, to say nothing of a realm to be reached by human activity, but is always constituted by God's action, which is likewise an *a priori*, that is, an operation carried through outside of all human activity' (pp. 71, 72). This Divine activity is the motive of human repentance and faith. This interpretation the author seeks to justify by a careful exegesis both of the parables and of the letters. (*b*) It is *opposed to*

---

[1] *Reich Gottes und Kirche im Neuen Testament*, von Dr. theol. Gerhard Gloege (C. Bertelsmann, Gütersloh, 1929; Mk.12.50).

this world. It is the coming in contrast to the present æon. The opposition to the cosmos is of a moral religious character, and yet it has too a positive teleological character in relation to the world, as not only a universal cosmical, but also an ethical-soteriological completion. (*c*) It is accordingly *present in the world.* The eschatological explanation must be limited. Present and future are one in the dynamic conception of God's rule, for in the activity of Jesus God is active. In opposition to the eschatological school the author affirms confidently that the available sources prove that 'Jesus not only proleptically, but in the full sense of the word regarded Himself, and accordingly was active as the Christ' (p. 142). (*d*) It is *redemptive*; God's constant activity in Christ forgives and imparts new vitality (*Lebendigkeit*). (*e*) It is *unconditional,* as will be manifest at the *Parousia.* The doctrine of the Resurrection sets aside the spiritualism of the Greek hope of immortality, and is characterized by realism. 'In this word (1 Co 15[28]) not only is the final purpose, for which the (Christian) community expectantly waits described, but also that occurrence by which the whole history of the world and man flows into the rule of God, to become one eternally with His kingly activity' (p. 200).

The second part of the book deals with the Church; and we could only wish that all the discussions on the reunion of the Churches went down as deeply into the roots of the matter. The Church-consciousness of the primitive community is described, and the description firmly links the two parts of the book together. 'Primitive Christianity found its very existence, in all that marked it as Church, singly and alone in its dependence on the sovereign action of God. All its confessions about itself have their elementary formal unity in this, that it had the source of its life in God, who had created it through Christ, and the goal of its life in God, who by Christ would complete it' (p. 202). The New Testament conception of the Church is also based on the Old Testament. The significance of the term *ecclesia,* as the claim of the Church to be 'the true Israel,' is recognized by the author. He is not content with this verbal connexion, but seeks a more vital. As regards its source, limits, and purpose the Church is, as was Israel, determined by God's sovereign activity. The connexion is similar to that with 'the remnant' of the Old Testament, the community saved by God, and possessing the Spirit. Having thus shown the Old Testament roots, the author defines the nature of the Church. Christ is the Creator and the Saviour of the community. It is the remnant, and this gives special significance to the circle of disciples. As regards the relation of the Church to the Kingdom, it is neither identical with the Kingdom nor yet a substitute for it; but it is the organ of the Divine action. 'This means: it owes its origin and its existence to the kingly act of God, but carries this at the same time forward independently by its own action, and exactly in this its own action has it its essential continuance' (p. 257). It is as both object and agent of God's activity that the Church is His organ. As such, the Church has the following characteristics: (*a*) it is *above the world.* Christ is 'the original element' of the Church, the foundation. God works in it by His Spirit. It is the body of Christ, and His 'bond-slave.' He is the Head of the Church, and it is His Bride. Close as is the relation of Christ and Church, yet it is not a mystical identity. That is excluded by the objective factor of the Spirit, and the subjective factor of faith. The relation always remains religious and moral. (*b*) It is *opposed to the world,* because holy, dominated by the Spirit, chosen and called of God, turned away from the world, as feeling itself a stranger and ready to suffer with Christ in the world. It is God's kingly rule that draws the Church towards Him, and away from the world. (*c*) It is *in the world.* Subject to the conditions of time and space, it is active in the world, and becomes an actuality in the world (*Dinglichkeit*), quantitatively as visible in the world and qualitatively as impure, and in conflict with sin. (*d*) It is *one.* The contrast of the total community and the local congregation is resolved in the thought of God's activity, which is the objective factor of its unity, while the subjective are the common faith, love, and hope. As a body the Church is unity-in-variety. As the one organ of God's activity on earth, the Church claims universality. As such a universal organ, its purpose is to bring about the human syntheses, not by merely proclaiming God's rule, nor by trying to establish God's rule, but by becoming the channel in the word of reconciliation in Christ of the kingly activity of God until the day when God shall be all in all. The careful exegesis on which the whole treatment is based is beyond praise. Sometimes the author inclines to be too meticulously critical of those who even in a small matter differ from him. His purpose is to give the New Testament teaching without any admixture of modern views; but he recognizes that some parts of the teaching of the New Testament, such as the eschatology, cannot be literally transferred to modern constructive

Christian thought. But no thought will remain Christian which neglects the New Testament. This volume as an informed, intelligent, and appreciative study of the New Testament deserves the warmest commendation.

Theology as Autobiography.

I HAVE in previous numbers of THE EXPOSITORY TIMES called attention to this valuable series, *Die Religionswissenschaft der Gegenwart in Selbstdarstellung*,[1] edited by Dr. Erich Stange. The editor in the preface states that the publisher has decided that this fifth volume must be the last. This decision is to be regretted, as, while most of the leading scholars and thinkers of Germany have been included, the list of those worth knowing has not been exhausted; and theology outside of Germany has had only a few representatives. Nevertheless, the possessor of the five volumes will have a wide survey of German theology at least, presented in the autobiographies of those chosen for the distinction of inclusion. The selection has not been partisan, as one volume has been assigned to Roman Catholic theologians. In this fifth volume are included Martin Dibelius, Paul Feine, Ferd. Kattenbusch, Emil W. Mayer, Willy Staerk, Paul Wernle—a varied selection. 'The personal equation' is not obtruded at all; and the interest is concentrated on the subjects with which each theologian has been led to deal. For instance, Dibelius has something to say about the development of *Formlehre*, and about the wider contacts of German scholars since the War. Feine sketches his own inner development as a reaction from the extreme liberal to the central evangelical position. 'It is the aim,' he says, 'of New Testament scholarship, as I see its task, to draw a picture of Christ which seeks to keep itself free of the false ways, on which the nineteenth century entered, and of the modern and most modern theories, which lead away from the New Testament traditions' (p. 81). Willy Staerk represents a similar reaction from the too exclusive use of the religious historical method of dealing with the Old Testament. The problem he states as follows: 'What way of presentation will be most readily just to this *systematic-theological* aspect of the Word of God in the Old Testament, and at the same time to the *religious-historical* therein, which cannot be overlooked in view of the characteristic structure of the religion of Israel as a *complexio oppositorum*, and of the temporal differences, and differences due to the development of the piety of the Old Testament witnesses' (p. 196). While Staerk welcomes the work of the coming generation as building upon the historical foundations laid by the last, Paul Wernle rather plaintively states that he does not expect any understanding of his labours from them. 'I am,' he says, 'firmly convinced that the at present so loved one-sidedness can only be a passing solution, and that especially the striving after harmony will not allow itself permanently to be driven out of the human soul, and consequently out of the theologian's soul' (p. 249). The harmony he desires is of the three ways of reaching norms, 'authority, religious experience, and thought.' Ferdinand Kattenbusch states that his special interest has been in Symbolics generally, but he has found the Apostles' Creed alone a great enough task. 'A last secret hope still remains for my labour: *the problem of revelation*. There naturally it will be necessary to clarify the thought of the "Word of God." I stand very sympathetically towards the latest theological formulation, that led by Karl Barth, which has express reference to this, but I cannot conceal that it runs the danger of a false development, and of turning against Luther. Yet I hope that it will find the way from Calvin to him' (p. 118). One of the contributors, Emil Walter Mayer, has since writing passed away. His life itself has a special interest in two respects. He was born, and his school education was in France, and he functioned as a professor in Strassburg; but Germany was by his own choice his 'fatherland.' His work has been on dogmatics, apologetics, and ethics. It is interesting to note that he confines the task of the Christian Church to cultivate the Christian disposition (*Gesinnung*), Faith and Love as the most important; and declines its participation in external arrangements. 'For example,' he says, 'a League of Nations may be in itself able to do a great deal that is good; but what is the use of such an institution, when its agents are filled not with a truly Christian disposition, but a selfish one' (p. 156). That was written in 1926 by a very patriotic German. These are but examples of the varied living interests which pervade the whole volume. A more attractive way of studying theology cannot be imagined; and one must be deeply grateful to contributors, editor, and publishers for realizing their purpose so admirably.

ALFRED E. GARVIE.

London.

---

[1] *Verlag von Felix Meiner in Leipzig* (Kartoniert; R.M.8.50, *In Ganzleinen Geschenkband*; R.M.12).

Entre Nous.

The Inward Vision.

It is a pleasant task to pass on the word that so great an authority as Miss Evelyn Underhill has found a new book worthy to be included in her very brief list of 'Modern Guides to the Spiritual Life.' This is not very new now—it was published last autumn—but is well worth getting and pondering. It is *The Inward Vision*, by R. H. J. Steuart, S.J. (Longmans; 5s.). Father Steuart has an original point of view and a very hopeful one; hope streams over the book like light. He is not always easy. Thus, we will quote a characteristic passage from the paper entitled 'The Mystery of His Will':

'The performance of His Will on my part consists essentially in my sincere *desire* to perform it, and that however conveniently (and so, within the bounds of my nature, on that account quite truly) I represent this will as some definite practical vocation which I must do my utmost to follow, I must yet always bear in mind that that vocation, as I represent it, is in itself no more than a formula. . . .

'I shall be strongly armed against the discouragement and the shadow of despair which dog the path of the idealist if I never allow myself to forget that the *substance* of my hopes must of necessity remain hidden from me till God has made the whole complete.

'God's will is done in me when my will is with constancy bent to His, whatever it may be; when all that I want—or want to want—is what He wants. For in God's eyes my success is not that in the end I have done what I tried to do, but that up to the end I have tried to do it.'

We commend to our readers also the meditation on the Power of God which contains this—he is speaking of the Presence of God every day all our lives long:

'I, who am self-forming, may build in this shape or in that; the pressure, always the same, adapts itself to each—the same law, the same light, the same love—not compelling my assent, indeed, yet following me with undiminished instancy upon my furthest wanderings and moulding itself into my worst sins, pressing even these into the service of my sanctification.

'This it is which has given to many, on looking back over their past lives, a strange—almost uneasy—awareness of some hidden Power, which, in spite of all their consciousness of free election, has seemed somehow to have been leading or driving them, without their knowledge, and has in the end made unison and harmony out of so much wilful incoherence and discord—suffering that has somehow come now to be understood as happiness, failure that is seen now to have been fulfilment, evil that has turned into good.'

We turned from this stimulating book to study a list of the other modern spiritual guides which we had, by the kindness of Miss Underhill herself, written down in a letter. Among them she would put Baron von Hügel's 'Letters' and 'Life of Prayer'; Maritain's 'Prayer and Intelligence'; Grandmaison's 'Personal Religion'; Dome Berse's 'Works on Mental Prayer'; Huvelin's 'Amour de Nôtre Seigneur' and 'Echoes'; and Dr. Benson's 'Spiritual Letters.' We shall all have our own list; but it is good to know hers. By the way, the reading of a quite new biography shows that that gallant young soldier Billy Congreve always carried in his coat a copy of 'The Practice of the Presence of God.'

C. Miles.

Shere.

Mark Guy Pearse.

The biography which has just been published by The Epworth Press of *Mark Guy Pearse, Preacher, Author, Artist* (3s. 6d. net), is a short one, but the reading of it repays one. It has been written by his daughter, Mrs. George Unwin, in collaboration with Mr. John Telford, B.A.

Mark Guy Pearse was born of Cornish parents in 1842. His people were amongst the first Wesleyan Methodists in Cornwall. One of his earliest memories is of how a dear old Cornish saint, 'Old Rosie,' would put her hands on his head and pray, 'God bless the little lad; bless him, Lord, and please, Lord, to make him a preacher, for Jesus Christ's sake.' He felt, he says later, that Rosie's words laid a spell on him that he could not break, for after a year or two as a medical student he gave it up and entered Didsbury College. He was ordained in 1869, while he was in the Bedford Circuit. From Bedford he went to London, then for a short time to a quiet country place, Launceston, and then Bristol. By this time he had decided he could do his best work if he were free to give most of his time to writing, and when asked to join Hugh Price Hughes in a mission in the West End of London he hesitated. Mrs. Hughes has described the interview that took place. '*For two hours*,' she said, 'my husband talked without stopping, setting forth his ideas and plans. Mr. Pearse *never uttered one word*. Can you imagine him silent for two hours? "Well, will you come?" asked Mr. Hughes at length. "Yes, I will," said Mark Guy Pearse, and with that he bolted, and so rapidly that Mr. Hughes had not even time to ask him for his London address.' As Mrs. Unwin says, it was a momentous decision. Mark Guy Pearse's part was to preach every Sunday morning and every Friday, and to assist in any other way he chose, but he was to be free from the cares of organization. From the beginning Mark Guy Pearse had been a pioneer in the Methodist pulpit. 'He set his face against contentment with a personal salvation. The key-note of his message was: "God save us from the selfishness of our salvation! 'He who saves his soul shall lose it' is a tremendous truth. The only way to save our souls is to give ourselves away in love. This is the truth we want declared with the deepest conviction and the greatest force we can put into it. The religion that fails to save a man out of selfishness into love will never save a man out of hell into heaven." . . . "Mark Guy Pearse's religion," wrote one, "is that which makes husbands come home early to tea and to their waiting families; which makes working-men give the lion's share of their wages to the wife; which makes everybody tender to little children, compassionate to prodigals, lovingly ministrant to the aged, the sick, and the dying."' He had great gifts and he made use of them all in his preaching. There was his power of imagination. With his Celtic temperament truth came to him by flashes of insight rather than by reasoning and research, and there was a vein of mysticism in his nature. In 'Daniel Quorm,' he says, 'An' mind not to forget the windows. Be sure o' that. Every sermon ought to be builded like the Lord told Noah to build the ark—*a window shalt thou make in the ark*. Put in a story or one o' the blessed Master's *likes*, and it'll be a window for to let the light in through.' He could not be dull himself, nor did he easily suffer dullness in others, and one day, the biography says, as he sat on the platform beside Mrs. Hughes, listening to a learned but somewhat lengthy divine 'proving' Christianity, he whispered, 'If he goes on another five minutes I shall become an atheist!'

Towards the end of his life he sent Mr. Telford a private letter in which he described his methods. 'It has been laid upon my mind, in looking over my long ministerial life, that whatever success may have attended it I ascribe mostly to the fact that I could never get a room big enough to hold the prayer-meeting. From a vestry where I found half a dozen I had a schoolroom with 250. I made that the "Big Wheel of the Church." I am writing this privately, because I should not like to publish what seems like proclaiming my self-importance. But to you I may say that the success of the prayer-meeting lay first in the fact that I always took it myself and could work out my own methods: that is *essential*. But, much more than that, I always prepared myself by an hour of quiet communion, and went with "the fire in my hand," as Abraham went up the mount. And in that hour of communion I generally got a little message for the prayer-meeting—often a message that I found later was exactly adapted to some condition or circumstance of somebody present. I got the principal men in the Church to come, and I told them they must take part, and they came. The most wonderful week was that in which I asked for slips from those who desired prayer for unconverted relatives or friends—of course, without names. The next week was our praise-meeting, when slips were sent up for special answers to prayer. I do not think it ever happened without having sometimes wonderful—it ought not to be wonderful—cases of conversion. . . . As I write I recall the days at Clifton and Portland, and elsewhere, when I have seen many sitting outside the schoolroom door, unable to get in, and remember how people came sometimes a distance because they heard that folks got converted there.'

The most popular of his books has always been 'Daniel Quorm and his Religious Notions,' but he himself liked 'Praise' best. Many of the last generation were nourished on his books—books in which religious truth is presented so attractively, with so much imagination and pictorial power and so much humour and kindliness. A number of his collections are still to be had from the Epworth Press—'Daniel Quorm,' 'Good Will,' 'Cornish Stories,' 'Short Talks for the Times,' 'Christ's Cure for Care,' 'A Village down West,' 'The Ship where Christ was Captain,' and his last book, 'He must Reign.'

After he gave up public service his pen was busy. In everything he saw the love of God, and he had a firm belief that the world was getting better. He held it was a sin to take gloomy views. 'Whatsoever things are lovely . . . think on these things' was one of his prescriptions, and to the very end his sense of humour never failed. On one of his last days as he lay apparently asleep on the sofa he opened his eyes and said to his son, '"The partridges will be saying their prayers to-day," and shut them again. We thought he was dreaming for a minute, until some one said, "Of course, it's the first of September to-morrow!"'

Total Abstinence.

'In 1882, when speaking at a big temperance meeting at the Colston Hall, Bristol, he [Mark Guy Pearse] said: "It took me nearly twenty years to see my way to thorough out-and-out total abstinence, and I am but three years old as an abstainer. . . . If circumstances can hedge the moderate drinker about with safety, if the amount one takes, and the place and the company in which it is taken determine the rightness or wrongness of moderate drinking, then I claim that no conditions can be found more favourable to utter and complete harmlessness than those in which I have moved. Now, what has been my experience? Bit by bit I have been driven in, by the sheer force of terrible and appalling facts, from my position to total abstinence as the *only* right and safe standpoint for any Christian man."

'He went on to describe the steps by which he came to make this decision. The first was the discovery—illustrated by stories—that total abstinence was a capital thing *for the working class.* Later, he found terrible havoc wrought by drink in a beautiful home where he had many times sat at the table taking wine, and lending the sanction of his position as a minister of Christ. It was too late to undo this harm, and, much perturbed in spirit, he resolved never to take anything except in his own house. The occasion that at last led him to sign the pledge may be told in his own words.

'"I had gone to the house of a troublesome teetotaller, who had that day buried his only son. . . . 'I do wish you'd join us,' he had said earnestly. I shook my head, and congratulated myself on my good company in Cana of Galilee. I went home, but that night I could not sleep. My thoughts and heart went out to this father in his grief. I said half aloud, 'I would do anything to comfort him'; at once it occurred to me, 'Sign the pledge and join him in temperance work; that would comfort him.' 'But why should I give up so much for him?' I asked myself. Then came words spoken, I thought, and still think, by the Master Himself. 'Thou talkest of My company at Cana of Galilee. What did I give up to comfort thee?' And once again I saw, not Cana, but Calvary. There hung my Lord in His great grief and agony and dreadful shame. For me He had laid down His life! Should I dare any more to quote His example? Yes, indeed I could, but for quite another purpose. 'We ought to lay down our lives for the brethren.' I sought my Lord's forgiveness for my blind selfishness."'[1]

Matthew xv. 26.

'Mr. Pearse kept his eyes and ears open everywhere. When he was in Greece he said to the Greek pilot, who understood English perfectly, "How many words have you in Greek for *dog*?" "Two," said the man. "There is the word meaning the nasty wild dog in the street, who is a pest and a devil"; and his face expressed the disgust he felt. "But the other word"—and his tone and countenance changed pleasantly—"is for the *little* dog that every one loves, that is like one of the family." He found in this an illustration for the story of the Canaanitish woman. To her Jesus used a word found nowhere else in the Bible—*lap-dogs*—"It is not meet to take away the bread from the children, and to give it to the little dogs." Instantly her eyes flashed triumphantly. She felt that the case was won. "Of course not, Lord, because the little dogs pick up the crumbs that fall from their master's table."'[2]

'My Father made them all.'

'I remember, as long ago as I can remember anything, hearing Dr. Burns Thomson, of the Cowgate Mission, opening a flower-show in his native town and mine. And I see and hear him at this moment as he waves his hands over the stacks of flowers, and says: "My Father made them all." And I never to this day see a summer-garden, or a flower-show, or a bouquet of beautiful flowers, that I do not hear a voice in my heart saying often, "My Father made them all." Such Divine wisdom is there in a word of faith and love fitly spoken in the open ear of a little child.'[3]

---

[1] Mrs. George Unwin, *Mark Guy Pearse*, 59.

[2] *Ibid.*, 103.

[3] A. Whyte, *The Nature of Angels*, 206.

Printed by Morrison & Gibb Limited, Tanfield Works, and Published by T. & T. Clark, 38 George Street, Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to The Editor, Kings Gate, Aberdeen, Scotland.

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

If our age rejoices in its rediscovery of the human Jesus it would appear now to be following that up with a rediscovery of the humanness of Paul. Paul is no longer studied as a stern logician or a systematic theologian; he is seen to be above all a Christian believer who speaks out of his own experience, and a missionary preacher whose supreme and passionate desire is to interpret and commend the grace of Christ to men. From this point of view Dr. J. Ernest Rattenbury has given us a most illuminating study of his Epistles. The title of the book is *The Testament of Paul* (Epworth Press; 7s. 6d. net), and it is defined in the subtitle as being 'studies in doctrines born of evangelical experience.'

Few are better qualified than Dr. Rattenbury to speak of evangelical experience. 'For many years I have worked among degenerate people, and have witnessed miracles which divine grace has wrought in the souls of men and women who have had no difficulty whatever in understanding Paul's evangelical theology, and who, by the practice of it, have been lifted from graves of loathsome sin to the shining heights of the heavenly places in Christ Jesus; and I have felt repeatedly, while reading learned books on Paul, that the simple experiences of such people throw a clearer light upon his letters than the words of many of his commentators.' Perhaps Dr. Rattenbury spends too much time on an exposition and defence of religious experience, and Christian experience in particular, but his justification is that it has so often been ignored by those who profess to make a scientific study of the Christian facts. 'It is simply amazing that men who stress the importance of scientific history should fail to see the unscientific character of their non-empirical dogmas.' There is a path of direct access through personal experience for which learning is no substitute, and without which the greatest scholar remains for ever an outsider. 'I know,' said Deissmann, 'when I begin an academic lecture on Jesus, that there is an unacademic way to Jesus, and that it is the best way, because it is open to all.'

St. Paul was the subject of a rich Christian experience. 'Paul's experience may be summarized as one of intimate friendship with his unseen Lord, beginning in the extraordinary personal experience of his conversion, but continuing through a life of outward elation and depression, struggle and difficulty, success and discouragement, expressing itself in heroic deeds, constant preaching of God's love for men, as well as in the vigorous thinking which is transmitted to us in his letters. He became a new creature; all things became new. Apart from his experience these things could not have been. Everything which he did of distinctive value to the world issued from his vital and vitalizing experience of God in Christ.'

Reflecting on his experience, St. Paul was faced with a great moral problem, the problem of his own justification and of God's righteousness in justifying him. His thoughts on the Atonement have often been criticized as unethical, but this is completely to misunderstand them. 'Whether or no Paul was successful, he was the pioneer in ethical treatment of the experiences of salvation, and his doctrines were his solution of the ethical problem which his experience raised. So far from thinking of him as the preacher of unethical evangelical doctrines, men should realize that he was really the first preacher of an ethical evangelism; that he stood supremely for a proclamation of righteousness, both man's and God's—God is Himself just and yet the justifier of sinners who believe.'

What is the ethical problem? It is the problem of God's righteousness in forgiving sin and treating the sinner as if he were guiltless. This problem is not created by Paul's theology, but arises out of the teaching of Christ Himself. Is it fair that the labourers in the vineyard who did a little work in the cool of the evening should be made equal to those who bore the burden and heat of the day? Is it fair that the prodigal son, and not his hard-working brother, should get the ring and the robe and the fatted calf? Is it fair that he who has merited condemnation should be acquitted, and instead of the punishment he has deserved should receive a royal welcome? To this problem Paul set himself, for he saw that it touches on the very righteousness of God. 'An interpretation of the Epistle to the Romans which ignores the fact that its author is as much concerned to prove that God is just as that He is the justifier of men ignores what is obviously fundamental in its teaching.'

Paul found the solution of the problem in the Fatherhood of God. Dr. RATTENBURY stresses, perhaps excessively, what he calls 'the family solution of Paul's ethical problem.' 'Now we come to what we believe to be the key for solving Paul's ethical problem—namely, that his experience of God in Christ was a filial experience in the context of the family life. He had left the law court—he forgot the things that were behind. He found nothing but despair in his futile moral struggles. He found in Christ a deliverer. And in Christ, who was revealed in him as God's Son, he found the Father. What he discovered was the ethics of the family, and he was satisfied that they were higher than those of the law court. . . . His justification was by faith—by trust in a Father's heart. Of course, in a sense it was not justification. Justification is a term that belonged to the law court. But when Paul spoke to men under the Law, or in their hearing, he was compelled to use the language they understood.'

To the objection that justification is a fiction—for if Paul was really a wrongdoer no amount of calling him good would make him good—Dr. RATTENBURY replies, 'But is this valid criticism? Is not this the only commonsense method of making anybody good? Is it not the very method pursued by all modern educationalists? Is it not precisely the method pursued by Jesus in all His dealing with degenerates, such as the woman in Simon the Pharisee's house and Zacchæus? . . . That is the way in which God treats a man. When a sinner He calls him; when a sinner is responsive and trustful, He justifies him—that is, He treats the sinner as if he were righteous (after all, it is God's way, so Jesus says, to send His rain and sunshine on the just and on the unjust alike)—and then, treating him as if he were righteous, he actually becomes righteous, "is glorified," made Christ-like, that Christ may be the first-born of many brethren. That is to say, "imputed righteousness" is "imparted righteousness" in the household of faith, but nonsense outside of it.'

On the question why grace is mediated through Christ Dr. RATTENBURY is less clear. He replies very effectively to the criticism that there is no atonement in the Parable of the Prodigal Son. 'Jesus spoke of God's mercy from the standpoint of God's Son. Paul says, "Ye know the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, who, though he was rich, yet for our sakes became poor." Should we have felt the graciousness of Jesus if He had talked about His grace and its free gifts? Even men do not talk about their own generosity when they give presents.'

But why must Christ die, and what did He accomplish by His death? Paul must have faced these questions. 'From the earliest days of his Christian life, Paul must have regarded the death of Christ as having some relation to sin. Can we think that he had in his own mind no systematized conception of the grounds of the grace of God? The answer is that, while Paul does not set forth a systematic doctrine of the Atonement, he must have had grounds for his beliefs, which were clear to him, though not so clear to us; but they are, perhaps, more likely to have been a series of intuitive convictions than a reasoned system.' Dr. Rattenbury falls back on 'the family solution.' 'To belong to God's family and to live on the family level is to justify love—God's love to man. Why trouble about reparation when experiencing regeneration into a new order of life, where men love their Father and His children? . . . Any man, however corrupt or helpless, whose soul is so quickened into a higher life that he becomes a new creation in Christ Jesus, justifies the morality of the ways of God, and reveals the fact that the true relation of a man to God is not that of a slave to his master, but of a child in a family to his father.'

The ultimate aim of gospel criticism, says a distinguished New Testament scholar, is to produce what is called, for lack of better designation, a Life of Christ. It is as a contribution towards a Life of Christ that he views all his own work. During the past twenty or thirty years he has followed up in published volumes the three principal lines of inquiry dictated by the nature of the sources, namely, (1) the story of Jesus' career as prophet and Messianic leader, for which the primary source is the Petrine-Markan record; (2) the nature and content of His message, for which the primary source, apart from Mark, is to be found by critical comparison of the teaching material of Matthew and Luke; (3) the permanent significance of His personality and work for the history and practice of religion, which involves a critical valuation and interpretation of the Fourth Gospel. Though his contributions taken together fall short, confessedly, of completeness, they are most lacking in the second of the three departments of inquiry above named. And the volume before us seeks so far to remedy this.

The title is *Studies in Matthew* (Holt, New York; $5.00), and the author, Professor Benjamin Wisner Bacon, D.D., Litt.D. (Oxon.), formerly of the Chair of New Testament Criticism and Exegesis in Yale University. A new work from his pen is always welcome; and this work on the First Gospel is very timely, as a reference to its contents will show. But let us say at once that its aim is 'to clear the way for such appreciation of the great religious Teacher as can only be gained by placing the witness of Matthew in right relation to the richer resources and more sympathetic touch of Luke.'

We may here add that Dr. Bacon hopes in 'such brief working time as still remains' to publish a historico-critical analysis and interpretation of the Fourth Gospel under the title 'The Gospel of the Hellenists,' and so to complete an earlier study in that Gospel.

In the volume now under review the author's deepest interest is in the question of sources. He would dispel the illusion that Matthew is a primary source, as being, if not of apostolic origin, a translation of an Aramaic Gospel by Matthew the Apostle. He would also explode the fallacy of the 'Matthean Logia.' The primary sources for the story and the message of Jesus are Mark and S, and S is not Q, nor is Q the 'Matthean Logia.' But we depend very largely for our knowledge of S upon what may be critically derived, directly or indirectly, from Q; and while we know something of S, we might have known much more if critics had not been obsessed for almost a century with the notion, for which Schleiermacher is responsible, that the compilation of the logia or precepts of Jesus to which Papias refers is to be identified with the common material (Q) used independently by Matthew and Luke to supplement the deficiencies of Mark on the side of teaching. This common material, though designated *Quelle*, Source, is not itself the source (S) on which Matthew and Luke drew, but only the most easily traceable factor of it.

Besides the two main synoptic sources, Mark (M) and S, Dr. Bacon recognizes three classes of material, which are designated P, Q, and R. P stands for the material peculiar to Matthew or Luke; Q, as already noted, the coincident or common material of Matthew and Luke not found in Mark; and R the material contributed by the redactor or editor. Allowance is also made for elements taken up from current oral tradition (O), and for a certain element, the Hebraistic, notably contained in Matthew's preamble, designated N on the hypothesis that it came from a precanonical form of Aramaic Gospel circulating among a body of Nazarene Christians.

The mention of Matthew's preamble leads us to the point that in seeking to give the First Gospel its true historical position and value Dr. Bacon arranges his Studies in a way that is designed to show the Evangelist's structural plan. For half a century it has been recognized that the main body of the First Gospel, apart from the Preamble and the Epilogue, consists of five discourses or sermons; and the recognition of it marks an epoch in the critical understanding and valuation of the work, which the public should by this time learn to regard as a compilation of gospel teaching in five parts from material furnished mainly by Mark and S. Accordingly here is the division of Matthew employed in the volume before us: Preamble (cc. 1–2); Book I, sub-divided into a Narrative A, introducing a Discourse B (cc. 3–4 and 5–7); Book II, similarly subdivided (A, cc. 8–9, B, c. 10); Book III, (A, cc. 11–12, B, c. 13); Book IV (A, cc. 14–17, B, c. 18); Book V (A, cc. 19–22, B, cc. 23–25); Epilogue (cc. 26–28).

This division of the material largely determines the method of study employed, which consists principally of Introduction. After the General Introduction, in which the external and internal evidences for sources, authorship, and date are critically sifted, comes the Special Introduction, in which each of the seven parts of Matthew's structural plan is similarly scrutinized, the emphasis here being on purpose, meaning, and the use of sources. Then follows a new Translation of Matthew in which sources are clearly differentiated. The concluding section of the work is comprised of discussions of the five themes presented by the Evangelist in the five discourses or sermons. These are the New Ethics of Jesus and the Law, the Apostolate, the Hiding and Revelation of the Mystery, the Problem of Church Unity, the Messianic Judgment.

There can be no question as to the timeliness of these Studies from the pen of an able and open-minded scholar of repute. As for their value, it will depend in large measure on whether they have succeeded in throwing new light upon the actual teaching of Jesus.

In the first section of his work, General Introduction, Dr. Bacon has subjected the tradition of the Matthean origin of the First Gospel to a very careful examination, and concludes that for real information concerning the background and origin of Matthew we are thrown back upon the internal evidence. From internal evidence he would assign Matthew to the date A.D. 80–100, or more exactly 90–95, a closer approximation being hardly required, because the history of that period is extremely obscure, and it is enough if Matthew is brought into true relation with its environment, particularly the mental environment of contemporary Christian literature. From internal evidence also he would say that the Q material in Matthew points to a single real document S, which, when in the hands of Matthew and Luke, if not of Mark also, had already advanced beyond the stage of being a mere collection of the sayings and doings of Jesus toward that of a biographical record, including the Passion story in some form.

Passing from the General Introduction to the Special Introduction, we note that the key to Dr. Bacon's discussion of the Preamble lies in the remark that 'the glory of the resurrection vision casts its ray backward into the deepening obscurity.' In the five books a certain uniformity, or rather conformity, in structural design is traced. And Matthew is found throughout his five books to have been faithful to Jesus' message as he understood it. But his use, which is no abuse, of the freedom allowed by Synagogue and Church alike to the haggadic writer reflects the converted rabbi of A.D. 90–100. A survey of the Epilogue confirms the conclusion, previously reached on broader grounds, that Matthew represents a late type of synoptic tradition, holding indeed a golden treasure, sacred, invaluable, but holding it in an earthen vessel.

On the third section, containing the new Translation, we remark that many will prize the work for it alone. It is not only that the translation is trustworthy and felicitous, but the spacing of the material is admirably done, and the marginal symbols clearly show the various sources from which, according to the conclusions reached by Dr. Bacon, the material is derived. Though Professor James Moffatt's conception of the sense is not always accepted, his 'telling phraseology' is in many instances employed.

The fourth and concluding section endeavours to set forth the actual teaching of Jesus, allowance being made where necessary for Matthew's application of the teaching to the needs and conditions of A.D. 90–95, and for the particular motives effective in the composition of his various books. In this section there is a wealth of matter which we would commend to the notice of the Biblical expositor and the Christian preacher, some of which, for example the interesting note on miracle under the second theme (the Apostolate), we should hardly look for in a work so fundamentally and intimately concerned with the problem of sources.

The author's theological tendency well appears at the close of the work, in his endeavour under the fifth theme (the Messianic Judgment) to penetrate the mind of Christ in His conviction of the triumph of righteousness. If the modern Christian insists on having both the New Jerusalem of the Jews and the mansions in the skies of Gentile eschatology—ideals literally as far apart as earth from heaven—there should be no need to despair of bringing into harmony the Jewish and the Greek conception of the future. 'We may well be thankful that our religion's strength is derived not from its Jewish ancestry alone. From the very earliest times there existed also a gospel according to the Hellenists, a gospel for which Paul claimed and obtained unshackled freedom of interpretation. In this Hellenistic tradition the example is set of penetration beneath the transitory form to the enduring substance. Whatever balance is then struck between Jewish and Greek modes of thought, apocalypse and mysticism, our ultimate confidence in the coming reign of justice will still be the indomitable, victorious faith of Jesus Christ in the God "that loveth righteousness and truth."'

These are the closing words of the volume proper (a number of useful and important Notes are appended), and they may be taken as forming the transition to Dr. Bacon's promised 'The Gospel of the Hellenists,' in which he will endeavour to show John's true place in the development of the religion *about* Jesus. Meantime we are indebted to him for this patient, scholarly contribution to our knowledge of the religion *of* Jesus.

The Trustees of the Arthur Davis Memorial Lectureship have been fortunate in their lecturers. Only lately we had occasion to comment with appreciation on Mr. C. G. Montefiore's 'Study in the Development of Universalism based on 4 Ezra,' and now comes another lecture—this time on *The Hope of a World to Come* (Allen & Unwin; 2s. cloth, 1s. paper)—delivered by Mr. Edwyn Bevan, M.A.

As the sub-title indicates, the hope which Mr. Bevan sets out to discuss is that 'underlying Judaism and Christianity,' so that his study has historical as well as theological interest. The first half of the lecture is occupied with the discussion of the relation of Persian to Jewish belief. Zarathustrianism and Mosaism alike look forward to some great final consummation, in which the earth is to be transformed and good to triumph over evil.

'Neither,' says Archbishop Söderblom, 'seems to have borrowed it from the other.' Is this view tenable?

It is well known that the vistas of hope which often conclude the denunciations and threats of the Hebrew prophets are regarded by many scholars as later exilic or post-exilic additions—a notable case being the epilogue of Amos. But there is a critical school which denies the necessity of such a conclusion. They maintain that the idea of a world-process ending in a golden age had been cherished by the thinkers of Babylon and Egypt long before the prophetic period, and that this idea had infiltrated into the mind of Canaan. It would consequently be familiar to the Hebrew prophets, and it is therefore futile to regard them merely as messengers of doom. Their message of hope is their own.

The question of possible Persian influence is complicated by the disconcerting fact that the dates assigned to Zoroaster fluctuate between the fourteenth century B.C. and 522, when, one scholar maintains, he was still alive. Mr. **Bevan**'s own conclusion is that 'it seems not unreasonable to believe that Jewish apocalyptic,' at any rate, 'did owe something to Persian influence.' He bases this conclusion on the fact that an idea analogous to the Persian conception of 'a world-process marked out in three-thousand-year periods' does not emerge among the Jews till we reach the Book of Enoch, whose earliest parts probably belong to the second century B.C.

But while that is true of this particular aspect of apocalyptic, Mr. **Bevan** does not believe that for their general conception of history as an age-long conflict between good and evil, a process guided by God, inspired by His purpose, and issuing in His triumph, the Hebrew prophets were in any way indebted to the Persians. Such a conception is already present in Amos and Isaiah.

This conception of a purpose inspiring the time-process, which was one of the great legacies of Judaism to Christianity, is now so familiar that it is with difficulty that we realize how life must have looked to men who did not bring this conception to the interpretation of it. To Græco-Roman society the world was but a 'vain eternal recurrence, leading nowhere.' And this very un-Hebraic attitude is reflected in the Book of Ecclesiastes, which must have been profoundly influenced by Hellenism. A German writer whom Mr. **Bevan** quotes attributes the victory of Christianity to its emphasis upon the idea that the time-process had meaning, value, and a goal; it began in the unique act of creation, and moved on to a unique consummation in the Kingdom of God, and was punctuated in its course by mighty acts of redemptive love.

A teleological view of this kind was peculiarly welcome to men who saw nothing but eternal repetition, with no hint of a forward movement, in the time-process, and to whom, therefore, all things were 'vanity.'

From these historical considerations Mr. **Bevan** passes on to the larger question. 'How do we stand to-day?' and he argues that, though our conception of the universe and of the duration of the time-process is immeasurably vaster than that held, say, even a hundred years ago, there is a real analogy between the view of the time-process presented by modern science and that presented by Judaism and Christianity. For modern scientists, doubtless with a few exceptions, regard that process as a continuous forward movement with unique moments, such as the moment when man arose from the animal, though science has neither the right nor the power to dogmatize about the issue of it all. Or, as Mr. **Bevan** puts it, 'If to-day Jews and Christians still adhere to the old faith that the time-process is being guided by God to some glorious end which will give its value and meaning to the whole, that is plainly not a conclusion of scientific research, but an act of religious faith, like the belief in the reality of God Himself.'

Mr. **Bevan** joins issue with Dean Inge, who, as is well known, has little use for a religion which rests on any hope regarding the future. The relative justification for this attitude, he points out, lies in the fact that 'no realization of the Kingdom of God under conditions of earthly space and time could be satisfying, and that any religion which made its chief concern an improvement of conditions on this planet would not meet the highest spiritual exigence of man.' The hope of 'a good time coming' in this world is too reminiscent of the materialistic dreams of some Jewish apocalyptic.

Yet Mr. BEVAN does not regard as absurd or unspiritual the hope that even on this planet man may be brought to a higher level of goodness or happiness. But while that is not an unreasonable hope to entertain, for one who understands the Christian faith it can certainly never be the great consummation of history. That can only be found in 'a communal bliss, an existence of the Divine community of spirits in perfection and mutual love and joy.'

This fine lecture, with its wide outlook upon history, its brave faith, and its cheerful yet solemn hope, is at once an intellectual treat and a spiritual stimulus.

◆

National Contributions to Biblical Science.

V. The Contribution of Germany to New Testament Science.

I.

BY PROFESSOR MARTIN DIBELIUS, D.TH., D.PH., HEIDELBERG.

THERE is justification for considering the history of scientific study within national limits. To begin with, it has often been the case that there has been no association in work between the scholars of different countries, with the inevitable result that in many cases conclusions had to be sought and established more than once, quite independently in every nation engaged in scientific research. This failure to exchange ideas continued longer in theology than in other sciences, for the diversity of ecclesiastical affiliation and the want of reciprocal activities between Churches had necessarily an influence on theology. In the commentary on *The Epistle of James*, by August Rudolph Gebser of Jena, which appeared in 1828, the author at the close of his preface speaks of 'my esteemed friends in England,' 'who have had their attention drawn to me by the work on which I am engaged, the *Bibliotheca Latina poetarum veterum Christianorum*.' From this manner of speaking, as well as from the fact that Gebser took the opportunity afforded him of expressing his gratitude for literary gifts from England, one may infer how infrequent such relations must have been at that time. The necessity for an international interchange of views was recognized earlier by scientific theologians than by the Churches, but now that ecumenical fellowship has to a very large extent begun among the Churches, scientific theology is bound to reap some benefit. To say the least, it will learn from ecumenical conferences that the most important condition of mutual understanding in every sphere is to be found in becoming acquainted with and in learning to appraise the intellectual forces of foreign countries. It is from this point of view that the following discussion should be understood; only so can the development of New Testament research in Germany have any claim on the sympathetic interest of English readers.

The restriction of one's view to the scientific development of a single people has an inner justification as well. For every separate branch of knowledge is dependent on the development of the intellectual life of the people, and that life again is the expression of the intellectual endowments of a nation in a definite historical situation.

How deeply influential these relationships are may be realized when one considers the two great achievements of German theology in the New Testament field, which, about the middle of last century, gave a decisive impulse to scientific research and provided the material for extremely fruitful discussions in the generation following—the *Life of Jesus* (1835–36), by David Friedrich

Strauss, and *Paul* (1845), the chief work of Ferdinand Christian Baur, the founder of the Tübingen school. Both these works were very deeply influenced by the philosophy of Hegel, which at that time was dominant in Germany. Strauss had learned from the great philosopher that no idea can realize itself completely in history, that accordingly the idea of incarnation in the value which it has is not dependent on the facts of the life of Jesus, and, that being so, that one may examine without the slightest prejudice, in a spirit of indifference even, under what conditions, in what way, and to what extent that idea has been realized in the Person of Jesus. Hegel's influence on Baur was mainly apparent in his delineation of primitive Christianity. His conception of the course of events was based on the presupposition that the Jewish-Christian Petrine party was in conflict with the Gentile-Christian Pauline party, and that by an immanent law the development was bound to lead to the harmonious adjustment of these opposites, the result of the process being the rise of the Catholic Church. The rhythm of the historical movement was thus described in Hegelian fashion as a sequence of thesis, antithesis, and synthesis.

It must, however, be admitted that it is not the philosophical conceptions of Strauss and Baur which make them figures of such importance in the history of New Testament science. What lends significance to their names to-day is their attitude to history. Strauss was the first who, with complete freedom from prejudice, raised the question of the 'mythical' interpretation of the Gospels. In so doing he did not use the word 'myth,' as we do to-day, in the sense of significant stories of the gods; he called every tale 'a myth,' in which an idea was expressed. In its bearing on the life of Jesus, the question of myth, in the sense in which Strauss used the word, is equivalent to the question whether the stories related of Jesus are really history and not representations of an idea. The application of this question to the life of Jesus led at once to the refutation alike of supernatural and of rationalistic interpretations; it involved also the keenest historical criticism of that Gospel, which may most easily be conceived as derived from an idea, the Gospel of John. The simple practice of harmonizing, which, with little critical sense, combined the narratives of the four Gospels, became after Strauss scientifically impossible. Not less great is Baur's service to history. Since he sought to explain the whole of primitive Christianity by the opposition offered by Jewish Christians to Paul's conception of salvation, and since he examined every New Testament writing with reference to its attitude in this conflict, all the writings of the New Testament became for him documents of the conflict. It was certainly an imperfect orientation, but there emerged the great and authoritative conception that these books, which were not written as 'books,' ought not to be regarded as books but as the sediment of an intellectual process. What, accordingly, the historian of primitive Christianity has to reconstruct is not only the world of ideas represented in these books but, above all, the historical process in which they originated. Baur was the first to take seriously the historical character of our work on the New Testament.

Both Strauss and Baur made many mistakes. But in their work they made use of principles which even to-day give guidance in the historical investigation of the New Testament. And through the new conclusions at which they arrived, they provided the scientific study of primitive Christianity with the decisive motives for further development. Consequently, a review of the more recent investigations into primitive Christianity must take their work as a starting-point.

I.

Is the content of the Gospels in reality 'mythical' to the extent that Strauss assumes? Was the development of the earliest Christianity in reality so essentially determined, as Baur declares it to have been, by the conflict between Paul and the Judaists? These are the questions which have formed the subject of scientific discussion since the time of Strauss and Baur. In them we find the decisive impulses to the literary as well as to the religious-historical criticism of the New Testament. The discussion was bound in the nature of the case to lead to the investigation of particular historical questions; even although it yielded other results than those for which Strauss and Baur had contended, the work of research nevertheless took its direction from Strauss's statement of the problem and from the reconstruction of Baur.

Research, which in this way was confronted with particular problems, had to specialize accordingly. This, again, was quite in harmony with the spirit of the age. It was the epoch in which natural sciences and technical arts experienced an impetus hitherto unknown, in which life was increasingly mechanicalized, and in which particularly the German spirit more and more renounced its romantic dreams and turned to the actualities of life. In the same way also the mental sciences were affected by a tendency to realism and—if one may use the expression in a figurative sense—to microscopic examination. Historical study was influenced less and less by the desire to search out laws of life which also govern our existence; it kept steadily in view the more realistic aim of showing how things actually were. Thus there began in the field of the New Testament an epoch of fruitful labours in literary criticism (I). When this had reached certain results, the endeavour was made to pursue farther the specialized work in Biblical theology; the undeniable risk thereby incurred of being bogged in details and of reaching a stage when (so to speak) the subject was resolved into atoms, one hoped to be able to overcome with the help of psychology (II). New texts were discovered and old ones were subjected to fresh examination; the knowledge of the environment of the New Testament which was thereby gained led to the religious-historical (III) and the sociological (IV) methods. The dialectic theology of the post-war period (V) appeared in this *milieu* as a fruitful and necessary reaction, which aimed not unsuccessfully at bringing theology back to a sense of her own peculiar task. It would, however, be false to characterize these movements as phenomena of epochs which followed one another in time. They cross one another and often overtake one another. The following discussion which, for convenience, deals with the individual phenomena separately is accordingly one governed by considerations of subject-matter, not strictly of chronology.

The questions which Strauss and Baur had bequeathed could be discussed and answered, only when the foundation on which they had built was subjected to fresh examination, that is to say, only when the question of Sources was dealt with anew. Criticism bearing on the life of Jesus could make no progress without the consideration of the Synoptic problem. Both Strauss and Baur considered Matthew to be the earliest Gospel. During the agitation which Strauss's *Life of Jesus* had occasioned, two books appeared, without attracting much attention, in the same year (1838), in which the opinion was advanced that Mark was the earliest evangelist (Chr. Herm. Weisse, *Die Evangelische Geschichte*, and Chr. Gottlob Wilke, *Der Urevangelist*). If later in the conflict of views about the Primitive Gospel theory, the Fragment theory and the Literary Dependence theory, the priority of Mark came to be almost universally acknowledged, that substantial gain must be placed to the credit of two German scholars—Bernhard Weiss in Berlin and Heinrich Julius Holtzmann in Strassbourg—who, though differing from one another in detail, established the conclusion on philological grounds that Matthew is secondary as compared with Mark. Moreover, the second of these scholars, in a series of careful studies, combined the Mark-hypothesis and the hypothesis of the 'Sayings' source into a whole, which, as the Two Source theory, is still the sure foundation of the criticism of the Synoptics. The German studies, too, dealing with the history of literary forms as well as the English attempts, with Luke as the starting-point, to reach further sources of the Gospels, would have been impossible without the basic work of the German critic. Holtzmann also accomplished much that was definitive for the criticism of the Pauline Epistles. Baur and his followers of the Tübingen school had left undisputed only the four great Epistles, to Rome, Corinth, and Galatia; the others were regarded as spurious or, at least, doubtfully genuine. Through his criticism of the Pastorals, Holtzmann showed that the authenticity of these Epistles was very improbable, and in the case of the other lesser Pauline Epistles he at least so far clarified the critical questions that further research was confronted with the real problems. Research in this field was naturally carried farther, as was also the case in the field of Gospel-criticism, but it cannot be said that in Germany any substantial agreement has so far been reached as to the results of the Two Source theory.

It looked as if literary criticism had entered on a new and flourishing period, when round about 1910 it became the accepted practice with its help to seek a solution of the great problem of the Gospel of John. The new impulse was mainly due to the work of Julius Wellhausen, the distinguished Old Testament scholar and Orientalist, and of Eduard Schwartz, the philologist (both of them at that time in Göttingen). Numerous differences in the text of the Gospel seemed to them to prove that the book, as we have it, was the revision of an original document, whereas others like Hans Hinrich Wendt in Jena believed they could detect different strata in the Gospel. The lively discussion which ensued led, however, to the conclusion that the Gospel of 'John' as a whole represented a religious-historical unity, and that the difficulties and perplexities could not all be explained by means of literary criticism. But many of the suggestions which we owe to this late phase of literary criticism have still their value in setting the problem and task for future research.

For the rest, the high level in the history of the spirit attained by the critical work of Baur was never again reached by the detailed studies of the generation which followed. Baur's great achievement consisted primarily in this, that he arranged the results of his criticism in a coherent historical conception of primitive Christianity and so made every detail serviceable to the understanding of the whole. The Tübingen school made further contributions to the development of this conception, and in this connexion Holsten, Hilgenfeld, and Pfleiderer should be mentioned. The last of these had a remarkable gift for combining Baur's results with the suggestions and investigations of the succeeding decades and, thanks to his amazing adaptability, for modifying the Tübingen conception of primitive Christianity so as to bring it up to date. For Baur's old reconstruction which made Jewish and Pauline Christianity issue in the synthesis of early Catholicism was no longer tenable. Albrecht Ritschl's book on *The Origin of the Old Catholic Church* and Adolf Harnack's *History of Dogma*, by which whole generations were profoundly influenced, had furnished the proof that Jewish Christianity was not in the least entitled to rank as a decisive factor in the whole process, but rather that the foremost place in this respect was to be accorded to popular Gentile Christianity. This, it must be admitted, did not have the effect of clearing up all the particular questions relating to the New Testament. Moreover, the specialized studies of the period did not succeed in putting a new conception of primitive Christianity in the place of that formulated by Baur.

It is accordingly not a matter for surprise that soon after Baur's time, and repeatedly in the course of later decades, serious attempts were made to reconstruct an altogether different scheme of primitive Christianity. The basis for this reconstruction was provided in every case by a criticism of the sources, which extended to the other New Testament writings the doubts cast by criticism on the Gospel of John and the Pastoral Epistles, and thus ended in acting as a solvent on the historical figures of Jesus and the Apostle Paul. The opinion was expressed that, however matters might stand with respect to the existence of the persons who bore these names, the Gospels were full of myths, and the letters of Paul were the work of a radical of the second century! The true home of this 'radical' criticism, however, was not Germany but Holland. Germany had its share in it only in so far as a few advances in that direction which caused some stir originated there. The motives which inspired this critical movement did not remain the same but changed as time went on. Bruno Bauer (not to be confused with Baur of Tübingen), who about the year 1850 occupied the standpoint of literary scepticism which to some extent was shared by the Tübingen school, later attempted in his book, *Christus und die Cäsaren*, a complete historical reconstruction. Influenced by the sociological knowledge and religious-historical investigations of a new age, Albert Kalthoff, at the beginning of the twentieth century, sought to explain Christianity as the result of the collision of Jewish Messianic expectations and the social movements of the Roman Empire. Finally, Arthur Drews took as his original starting-point a conception of the philosophy of history, in which the supra-historical idea of incarnation was the primary fact in Christianity; in the years after the war, however, he endeavoured to find a comprehensive interpretation of the story of Jesus as a myth derived from astral and Old Testament motives. The result of the controversy to which these theories gave rise was not the triumph of the 'mythical' theory but rather a sharper emphasis laid on definite questions still unsolved. Scholars became alive to the fact that the bridge had not yet been discovered which led from Paul and the questions with which he was concerned to the altogether different complex of problems associated with early Catholicism, and they began to realize how much work had been left over by the research of specialists in the closing century.

II.

We have, however, anticipated the order of events. The careful investigation of particular literary and theological questions which has been described was, and continued to be, the characteristic of the decades subsequent to the critical work of the Tübingen scholars and to the fundamental studies of Holtzmann. The intellectual conditions in the new German Empire bore the same character as that which dominated the economic situation—accumulation of wealth and division of labour. To-day it has become the fashion in Germany to speak disparagingly of this specialization. But it ought not to be forgotten that the careful individual studies of the New Testament, of the environment and teaching of Jesus and of particular ideas in the Pauline Epistles, laid the foundation on which all later writers, including the critics of the past, take their stand, and that that period has achievements to its credit which will always evoke admiration for their insight and amazing erudition. In this connexion special mention should be made of Schürer's *History of the Jewish People in the Time of Jesus Christ*, of Jülicher's *Parabolic Sayings of Jesus*, of Adolf Harnack's and Theodor Zahn's works on the Apostolic Age. It was due to the character of the age that there was an abatement of the inclination and consequently of the capacity for historical synthesis and construction which alone could have combined the parts into a whole.

There was, however, a consciousness of this defect, and attempts were made to remedy it. Assistance came from reconstructive psychology. Endeavours were made to solve the problems of the life of Jesus as well as the questions of Pauline theology by substituting the subjective unity of the spirit for the unity of structure which was no longer discoverable. That applies above all to the life of Jesus. It seemed impossible to write a real history of Jesus with the aid of the Synoptics. Their diversity in the manner of arrangement excluded all knowledge of a chronological sequence of events; the peculiarity of the Biblical account explained nothing, revealed no causal connexions, supplied no bond of unity. A true presentment of the purpose and activity of Jesus seemed possible only when these omissions were made good with the help of psychology. Thus there were produced the more or less critical portrayals of the life of Jesus by Bernhard Weiss, Willibald Beyschlag, Oscar Holtzmann, and P. W. Schmidt; these had been preceded, still to some extent on the basis of older presuppositions, by Strauss's *Life of Jesus for the German People*, and by the works of Schenkel Keim, and Hase. There was a desire to explain and to understand; the result was interpretations of miracles and reconstructions of the purpose of Jesus. The questionable element in all this was the subjectivity of the criticism of history, and what aroused still greater misgiving was the subjectivity of the psychological reconstruction, which frequently was in closer correspondence with the author's own ideas than with the picture in the New Testament, and thus, in spite of the author's desire to deal honestly with his material, gave a false drawing of the life of Jesus through representing it as that of an upright man of the peasant class or as an example of an interesting career.

(*To be continued.*)

Literature.

RABBINIC LITERATURE AND GOSPEL TEACHINGS.

UNDER the above title Mr. C. G. Montefiore, D.Litt., D.D., has published a book of four hundred and forty-two pages (Macmillan; 15s. net), which he describes as a sort of supplement to his 'Commentary on the Synoptic Gospels,' the second edition of which appeared in 1927. The book is enriched by interspersed criticisms and comments from the pen of Mr. Herbert Loewe. The average Christian scholar is notoriously ignorant of the Talmud, and is therefore strongly tempted, in his ignorance, to depreciate the teaching of the Rabbis; in any case, as Dr. Montefiore says, you can fish out from the Talmudic sea what suits your purpose, and it should mean much to the New Testament student to have the evidence of the Talmud, at points where it has any bearing upon the teaching of Jesus, presented by a mind so eminently fair as that of Dr. Montefiore. He has no desire either to depreciate Jesus or to exalt the Rabbis; his only ambition is to discover and interpret the facts and their relation to one another, so far as that is possible.

The exhaustive nature of the discussion will be seen from the fact that no less than two hundred and one pages are devoted to the Sermon on the Mount. The rest of Matthew is disposed of in one hundred and forty pages, and the remainder is given to Luke. The value of the book is enormously enhanced by its continual reference to and occasional challenges of Strack and Billerbeck's monumental volumes which can hardly be familiar in this country except to expert students of the New Testament. Dr. Montefiore pays more than one compliment to the accuracy of Billerbeck, and Moore's 'Judaism,' with its magnificent mastery of the facts and its serene objectivity, commands his admiration. But the writer goes his own way, often a delightfully chatty way, to which, perhaps, he is encouraged by the large number of illustrative anecdotes he has to narrate from his sources.

At every turn this learned book throws light upon the Gospels, but for Christian readers one of the chief points of interest will be its discussion of the originality of Jesus. In some incidents or utterances Dr. Montefiore frankly admits His originality; in others he is inclined to challenge or deny it. In commenting, for example, on Mt $9^{11f.}$, where Jesus eats with publicans and sinners, he says, 'Here we meet a new and gracious characteristic of Jesus, and to it there are no parallels in the Rabbinic literature.' Again, in connexion with the picture of Jesus forgiving His enemies at the last hour (Lk 23^{34}), he asks what corresponding picture Jewish scholars could bring from the martyrologies of the Rabbinic literature, and adds, 'I am bound to reply that, so far as I know, there is none.' On the other hand, he assures us that Mt $5^{21f.}$ shows no real advance upon Rabbinic teaching. 'Anger was just as much denounced by the Rabbis as by Jesus.' It is even parenthetically suggested that Jesus was apt to forget the Sermon on the Mount in the heat of conflict, and to show little enough love to the 'vipers and children of hell,' with whose religious opinions He disagreed, and whose characters He disapproved of. 'The teaching of Jesus is original both in what it says, and in what it does not say: it is original in its bulk as coming essentially from one man, or as constructed in his spirit; it is original in certain definite enunciations and demands; it is original in its combinations and as a whole; it is original in its pronouncedly prophetic and anti-ceremonial utterances and spirit,' and the priority, where there are Rabbinic parallels, is almost always on the side of Jesus. Nevertheless, says Dr. Montefiore, the later Rabbinic parallels are genuine developments and not borrowed from the Gospels. 'The truth lies between Jewish exaggerations on the one hand and Christian exaggerations on the other.'

No brief notice can give the remotest idea of the fulness and appositeness of the material adduced from Rabbinic literature in illustration of the Gospels; for example, no less than fifty-two pages are devoted to Mt 5^{43-48}, the verses on the love due to enemies, which Dr. Montefiore describes as the central and most famous section of the whole Sermon. It is a highly educative discussion, and a model of impartiality: 'the truth is that the Rabbis are not entirely of one mind on the matter of loving or hating the non-Jew.' Incidentally, theological questions of high import are raised. Here is a statement, for example, which has its bearing on the doctrine of the Person of Christ. 'If R. Nathan or R. Zadok or R. Elazar could say "my Father," without any idea in their minds that they were semi-divine beings, why should not Jesus? Is it not enough to assume that he felt God to be his divine Father with peculiar and passionate intensity?'

A NEW COMMENTARY ON ST. LUKE.

In the last few years the long-continued interest in Lucan studies has borne fruit in the commentaries of E. Klostermann, M. J. Lagrange, A. Loisy, L. Ragg, and B. S. Easton; and to these an excellent work has now been added in Canon J. M. Creed's *The Gospel according to St. Luke* (Macmillan; 15s. net). Canon Creed's commentary is based on the Greek text. It fills a gap in British work which has long been felt, for Dr. A. Plummer's still valuable work in the 'International Critical Commentary' series is now thirty-four years old, and in consequence is not abreast of current research. This cannot be said of the new commentary, since it is obviously based on a full knowledge of the critical discussions of Bultmann, Dibelius, Meyer, Loisy, Lagrange, Klostermann, and Cadbury, and strongly reflects the influence of Wellhausen. The problems of Introduction are treated in some eighty closely printed pages, and over three hundred pages are devoted to the commentary proper. Canon Creed's attitude to source criticism is conservative. The unfavourable attitude to Streeter's Proto-Luke theory which he has held almost from the first is maintained, but, strangely enough, a detailed discussion of the hypothesis is wanting, and this is also the case with respect to Easton's elaborate argument in favour of an L document. In the valuable section on Language, Style, and Vocabulary, Canon Creed follows Lagrange closely. We are in agreement with much that is said in this chapter, but we should like to have seen a fuller recognition of Moulton's useful distinction between 'Semitisms' and 'secondary Semitisms.' It is interesting to note that, while full justice is done to the arguments of H. J. Cadbury, Canon Creed thinks that this American scholar 'has not demolished the relevance of *some* of the evidence which has been collected, and in a few cases he has unduly depreciated the force of the medical parallels' (p. xix). The Lucan authorship, it may be added, is fully accepted, and the Gospel is dated A.D. 80–85.

The commentary proper is much bolder than the Introduction. Indeed, Canon Creed is perhaps over ready to adopt radical suggestions from Wellhausen, Loisy, and Bultmann. His willingness to admit that the story of the Gerasene Demoniac may possibly have been 'a popular tale which in some way that cannot now be recovered came to be attached to Jesus' (p. 120) is a case in point. The interesting question, indeed, is raised whether in these days conservatism in source criticism does not lead to the necessity of speaking too often of 'the free creations' of 'Luke's historical imagination.' On the other hand, it must be fully recognized that Canon Creed has succeeded in writing an intensely interesting commentary, in which reflection, agreement, and disagreement are prompted on almost every page. He has seen that the first duty of a commentator on the Gospels is to explain the meaning of the original and to place its statements in their historical relationships, and perhaps this is the explanation of a welcome reduction in the number of the Patristic references so plentifully present in the commentaries of the nineteenth century. Canon Creed's volume is a brilliant contribution to critical research, and is really indispensable to a serious study of the Gospel. We feel bound to add a word of appreciation for the beauty of the printing and the accuracy with which the proof-reading has been done.

EUCHARISTIC THEOLOGY.

Is it possible to provide an *eirenicon* in connexion with the Eucharistic controversy? The Bishop of Gibraltar (Dr. F. C. N. Hicks) believes that it is possible, and there is every probability that he will succeed in convincing many of his readers that his hope is justified. In *The Fullness of Sacrifice* (Macmillan; 15s. net) he argues that the fatal source of misunderstanding has been the erroneous idea that sacrifice is the equivalent of death and destruction. For the Reformers this meant that the Cross alone could be conceived as the Christian sacrifice, and Dr. Hicks agrees that 'under the limitations of the language which . . . all Western Christendom had unconsciously agreed to use, they were right.' 'That which was done on the Cross was unique. It was all-availing. Its merits were infinite. If it had to be called the Sacrifice of the Cross, there could be no other' (p. 330). The consequences for the holders of 'Catholic' doctrines were no less serious. Inheriting a conception of the Eucharist to which sacrificial language had at all times been attached, they found it necessary to speak of Christ's sacrifice as repeated daily upon the altar. 'If the sacrifice was thought of as in some sense an "immolation," then, however insensibly, it was bound to follow that the Body and Blood should be thought of as the Body and Blood of Christ as slain. The path was open, to popular faith, for visions of bleeding hosts, and to popular interpretations of the Presence which can only be called materialistic' (p. 314). From a close study of the language and the ideas of the Old and New Testaments, Dr. Hicks shows that the equation 'sacrifice = death' represents a fundamental error. The true Biblical conception includes three stages or ideas: first, the surrender of life; secondly, the offering of life so surrendered, and its transformation in God's acceptance; and, lastly, the union between God and man, and man and man, by communion in the life so transformed. It is against this background of ideas that both the Atonement and the Eucharist should be understood; the Eucharist belongs to the third stage in the Christian sacrifice, 'the sharing of the Life that has been set free in the surrender of the Cross, and offered, accepted, and transformed' (p. 341); it is 'an integral part, for us on earth, of the One Sacrifice in its fullness' (p. 346).

The attractiveness of this view will be at once apparent. Difficulties remain, it is true, especially the question whether the Body and Blood of the Eucharist are the Body and Blood of the glorified (not the crucified) Christ. But Dr. Hicks has undoubtedly succeeded in lifting the whole subject on to a new plane. It will be instructive to see what influence his invaluable study has upon the discussions of the Lambeth Conference, and whether he is right in his conviction that 'it should be possible, at long last, to bury controversy about the "Eucharistic Sacrifice"' (p. 346). The book reveals a noble spirit and a richly stored mind, and is much the most important contribution to Eucharistic theology we have seen for many a long day.

THE TEACHING OF KARL BARTH.

The work of Karl Barth and the Swiss School, which has stirred the theological world on the Continent so profoundly, has for some time back been exciting interest and inquiry on this side of the Channel. For this reason a warm welcome is sure to be given to *The Teaching of Karl Barth*, by the Rev. R. Birch Hoyle, A.T.S. (S.C.M.; 7s. 6d. net). Karl Barth is confessedly a difficult writer. His style is so explosive, so abounding in paradox, his dialectic method with its Yes and No is so bewildering, and his theology is so terrific that the whole effect produced often resembles the crash of thunder or the violence of shell-fire. To give an orderly exposition of his teaching is no easy task, but Mr. Hoyle has achieved a high degree of success.

In the first part of his book he gives an account of the rise of the Barthian School, of the dominant influence on it of Soeren Kierkegaard 'the sad and melancholy Dane,' of its attitude to previous German philosophy and theology, and of its relation to the new world that has arisen from the war. The main part of the book is occupied with an exposition of the Barthian message—of the transcendence of God, the brokenness of humanity, the word of salvation in Christ, and the crisis in which God and man meet and man may pass from death to life. In two concluding chapters Mr. Hoyle discusses critically Barth's dialectic method and his doctrinal position. The book is not easy reading, partly because it is so compressed, and partly because it consists so largely of quotations from the writings of Barth and Brunner which are not made any simpler by being detached from their context. But Mr. Hoyle has done a very excellent bit of work and has thereby rendered a real service to the Christian cause. Whether we agree or disagree, Barth has to be reckoned with. We can see now that the reaction which he represents was bound to come. When God was being conceived simply in terms of indulgent fatherhood, when everything in religion had become so easy and familiar, some deep voice was bound to be heard repeating again the awesome things which Isaiah and Paul and Augustine and Luther and Calvin had before spoken of God. It was given to Karl Barth to pull the church bell, as he himself phrased it, whose solemn tones have broken the dogmatic slumber of our time, and this echo of them which Mr. Hoyle has given us deserves to resound throughout the English-speaking world.

CHRISTIAN UNITY.

In 1924 Dr. G. K. A. Bell, then Dean of Canterbury (now Bishop of Chichester), issued a series of *Documents on Christian Unity* (Milford; 7s. 6d. net), covering the years 1920–24. He has now edited a second series (6s. net). The two series may be obtained in one volume (12s. 6d. net). The new second series includes fifty-four fresh Documents and, as is justly claimed, adds another chapter to the story of the movement for the Reunion of Christendom.

The selected documents relate to (1) the World Conference on Faith and Order held at Lausanne in 1927; (2) the Conversations at Malines, 1921–25, between Roman Catholic and Anglican divines under the presidency of Cardinal Mercier; (3) the Joint Conference at Lambeth Palace, 1921–25, between representatives of Episcopal and non-Episcopal communions upon the subject of the Lambeth Appeal. Besides these, there are documents relating to the Eastern Orthodox Church, the Old Catholic Churches, the Moravian Church, the individual non-Episcopal denominations in England, and the Universal Christian Conference on Life and Work held at Stockholm in 1925. The second series also contains the Proposed Scheme of Union in South India and the Resolutions with regard to it adopted by the three negotiating communions—the South India United Church, the Wesleyan Methodist Church, and the Church of India, Burma, and Ceylon.

The documents are interesting and informative in themselves; and one welcomes the evidence they supply that the spirit of unity is to-day operative in the Churches as perhaps never before. But the official attitude of the Eastern Orthodox Church and of the Roman Catholic Church shows that many chapters must be added to the story before the movement for the Reunion of Christendom will have reached its goal. 'The mind of the Orthodox Church is that reunion can take place only on the basis of the common faith and confession of the ancient, undivided Church of the seven Œcumenical Councils and of the first eight centuries.' 'According to the Orthodox Church, where the totality of the faith is absent, there can be no *communio in sacris.*' The Roman Catholic Church is equally intransigent, and even regards the 'pan-Christian' movement as cloaking 'a most grave error, subversive of the foundations of the Catholic faith.' It is the error of suffering the truth revealed by God to be made a subject for compromise. And among revealed truths the dogmas of the Immaculate Conception of the Mother of God and the Infallibility of the Roman Pontiff are to be accepted with the same faith as the mystery of the august Trinity and the Incarnation of our Lord.

THE QUEST FOR CERTAINTY.

In one respect at least recent Gifford Lectures show an advance. Some of them have been distinctly literary in form and intelligible to the reader of ordinary attainments. Professor John Dewey's Edinburgh series of 1929—*The Quest for Certainty: A Study of the Relations of Knowledge and Action* (Allen & Unwin; 10s. 6d. net)—is an outstanding example of this improvement. The style is charming, the presentation bears at least a surface appearance of perspicuity. Yet, as in all

Professor Dewey's work, this perspicuity turns out often to be only on the surface. That, we think, is inevitable in Pragmatism, for he is a Pragmatist. It all seems so obvious, even rudimentary, and then turns out not to be obvious at all. The view is that knowledge is in closest relationship to action; successful action in fact is the very criterion of truth. We are in life confronted with situations which present problems; we try this and that, and by the consequences we judge; when the particular problem is solved the theory of it that solved it is proved to be true. That seems obvious. The trouble is that problems may be solved by illusion or falsehood, and that is the difficulty which Pragmatism has never really mastered and never really faced.

With much of Professor Dewey's criticism of traditional epistemologies we agree, with some of it we profoundly disagree. We have not space to evaluate his views, nor would the majority of our readers perhaps thank us for so occupying it even if we had. There are two points, however, which Professor Dewey makes, which are of great value and far-reaching significance. The first is this—the grand mistake of the traditional philosophy was that the thinker regarded himself as a spectator. By doing so he raised questions that are insoluble. We are not spectators, we are participants. That is a point of the utmost importance, not only in philosophy but in theology. The problem, for instance, of Predestination and Freedom is raised in insoluble form if we take the attitude of spectator.

Secondly, Laws of Nature, it is cogently pointed out, have changed their character. Science no longer regards them as rigid bonds to which all phenomena must conform. A principle of indeterminancy is now recognized, and a law of Nature is only a formula for the prediction of the probability of an observable occurrence. The consequences of this change are far-reaching. For the heartless *laissez-faire* policy of the nineteenth century which held it was hopeless to fight against economic law was rationally based on the prevalent views of laws of Nature. The earnestness with which Professor Dewey contends against this view of 'economic law' and summons philosophy to a new and truer task which includes the 'framing of reflection upon needs congruous to present life,' is altogether admirable.

EPISCOPACY.

It is the conviction of many Christians that if Christendom is ever to be re-united in one body, that great Church will have to be Episcopalian in government. All interested in Christian re-union will therefore welcome a work dealing in a comprehensive way with that ecclesiastical system, and we bespeak, and think we can promise, a very cordial reception to the one now before us—*Episcopacy Ancient and Modern* (S.P.C.K.; 12s. 6d. net).

It is a collection of Papers by thoroughly competent writers on Episcopacy at different times and in divers regions. It is not, it definitely disclaims to be, a history of the Episcopal office. Its aim is to illustrate the practical working of Episcopacy and its degree of elasticity in admitting of modifications; so that the reader may learn what is essential, and what is matter of expediency or local arrangement, about a bishop's duties, responsibilities, powers, and prerogatives.

To begin with the Preface, written by the editors, Dr. Claude Jenkins and Mr. K. D. Mackenzie, it is no ordinary foreword. We recommend that it be carefully read first, constantly referred to, and re-read after the whole volume has been gone through. It explains the aim of the work, is here and there wisely critical of some of the statements of the Papers, and as to some others saves us from misunderstanding.

The substance of the book consists of chapters on 'The Origin of Episcopacy,' 'The Position of Clergy and Laity in the Early Church in Relation to the Episcopate,' 'The Mediæval Bishop,' 'The Anglican Communion' (two sections), 'Episcopacy in the Roman Catholic Church,' in the Eastern Church, in the Church of Sweden, in the Old Catholic Churches, 'The Continuity of the Ministry in Scottish Presbyterianism and Methodism and among the Moravians,' 'Episcopacy and Re-Union,' and, finally, 'The Free Churches and Episcopacy.'

Every writer speaks with adequate knowledge of his subject and perfect courtesy towards those who are likely to differ from the views expounded, and every paper has its own merit. Apart from ecclesiastical views, the reader will find conveniently collected and arranged a mass of objective information not readily accessible elsewhere. Controversy is avoided so far as possible, but we like the most controversial chapter—'Episcopacy and Re-Union' —none the less although we disagree with a great deal of it. It is, we think, altogether wise in the frankness with which it sets forth the views which are very dear to a great many Episcopalians, and gives warning of the folly and danger of watering down to ambiguities what to some minds are vital truths. Union might be achieved on such cheap ambiguous terms, but the risk would be great of fresh and even more deplorable schism. We are sure that Dr. Darwell Stone is right in that fear and has done well to sound this note of warning. Better wait for re-union for a long time yet, than rush into a premature union on ambiguities which only temporarily conceal (yawning) chasms of fundamental and far-reaching disagreement.

The name of Max Weber is not so well known to English students as it deserves to be. His premature death in 1920 left his great work on the sociology of religion incomplete, but he has made a deep impress on the German thought of the last twenty-five years. *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism*, translated by Mr. Talcott Parsons (Allen & Unwin; 10s. 6d. net), when first published a quarter of a century ago, aroused intense interest and initiated a discussion which has continued with undiminished vigour. The present issue includes an enormous supplement of footnotes which contain both a mass of new material and replies to criticism, showing how the problem grew in Weber's mind. The problem which Weber sets for himself is to discover the psychological conditions which made possible the development of capitalist civilization. To trace the rise of capitalism simply to the acquisitive spirit is no explanation. 'The impulse to acquisition has in itself nothing to do with capitalism. . . . One may say it has been common to all sorts and conditions of men at all times and in all countries of the earth. It should be taught in the kindergarten of cultural history that this naïve idea of capitalism must be given up once and for all.' In his approach to the problem, Weber is guided by the universally acknowledged fact that 'business leaders and owners of capital, as well as the higher grades of skilled labour, and even more the higher technically and commercially trained personnel of modern enterprises, are overwhelmingly Protestant.' This leads to a close analysis of the Protestant spirit, especially as seen in Calvinism. This was the tonic which braced the pioneers of the new economic order to elbow their way to success in the teeth of the established aristocracy. A man's 'calling' came to mean, not the sphere in which he was placed by God, but an enterprise chosen by himself and pursued with a sense of religious responsibility. 'Baptized in the bracing, if icy, waters of Calvinist theology, the life of business, once regarded as perilous to the soul, acquires a new sanctity.' In an admirable foreword, Mr. R. H. Tawney suggests certain qualifications of Weber's theory, but the judicious reader will find the exposition full of brilliant analysis, and profound reflection on the interplay of religious, social, and economic influences.

The New Testament is undoubtedly a missionary book, and it is fitting that a series of handbooks should be issued to elucidate its missionary message. Two of these handbooks are before us, each excellent in its own way.

The Acts of the Apostles, by the Rev. F. Townley Lord, D.D. (Carey Press; 2s. 6d. net), is not a critical or exegetical commentary, but rather a broad survey of the dramatic story unfolded by St. Luke. 'Our concern is with the men and women of the Apostolic Church, with their experiments, failures, and successes. We set out to understand, if we can, the explanation of the remarkable energy and enthusiasm which sent the primitive communities into an ever-widening campaign of evangelism.' The writer succeeds in painting a vivid and intensely interesting picture of the early Church setting out with inspired zeal upon her great task and organizing herself for its accomplishment.

In *The Epistle to the Romans*, by the Rev. Henry Cook, M.A. (Carey Press; 2s. 6d. net), we have 'an exposition of the central ideas in the gospel as Paul himself understood them, and the universal outlook of the Christian message is constantly emphasized.' Its fundamental themes of sin and salvation lie beyond all differences of race. This little commentary is singularly successful in bringing us into touch with Paul the living man, and in conveying to us something of his missionary fire.

The literature on gambling is fairly extensive, but the problem is freshly treated from a somewhat new angle in *Gambling and Christian Ideals*, by Mr. Cecil H. Rose, M.A. (Epworth Press; 2s. 6d. net). The writer does not give, as is commonly done, the facts in detail as to the prevalence and effects of gambling, but confines himself to the question whether gambling is wrong in principle. His treatment consists in the main of an exposition of the Christian ideal of love to God and man in its bearing on the question. He finds that gambling 'conflicts with our sonship of God, whose very nature is self-giving, because its appeal is to the acquisitive in our nature divorced from the creative. It further involves a denial of the obligations of service and sympathy towards our fellows, and a taking without giving in return "good measure pressed down and running over," which is the direct antithesis of our Father's love.'

In *Artificial Silk* (Hodder & Stoughton; 7s. 6d.) Miss Christine Orr gives one such an impression of rich and yeasty immaturity that it is surprising to recall that she has already published four novels and a volume of poetry. Perhaps it is her technique rather than her mind which is immature. We doubt if she takes that part of her job seriously enough. She might say life is too short, and the world in too much of a mess, to bother about technique. Would she not be wrong? For this young writer has something to say; the prophet's mantle is discernible upon her shoulders. Her serious characters, unlike most characters in current fiction, have all that sense of *vocation* which is so marked a quality of the best youth of the rising generation. But the craftsmanship is not competent, and in the eyes of too many important critics only the highest technical excellence would excuse a novel so moral, so religious, so prophetic. And, after all, that is not an attitude any of us dare cavil at, who believe in the beauty of holiness. No one who has read *Artificial Silk* could deny that its author had experienced some of the 'costingness' of spiritual experience. But does she know enough of the 'costingness' of the artist's experience?

It is difficult to quote passages from this book: the sayings lose heavily without their setting, but here are one or two. 'I wish the die-hards would acknowledge how brave the moderns are, willing to face death in the dark rather than cry out for a night-light of make-believe. Only, myself, I know God's got something better than a night-light for me. . . .' 'D'ye know my idea about the narrow way? Well, it's this—a spiritual equilibrium! I think that's what Christ meant.' 'When I say "beauty," I mean something ecstatic and dangerous, as dangerous as life itself.' And lastly, 'Loving wasn't sin. It couldn't be. The sin was hurting other people because of your love.' That is a deep and a true saying.

Last month a sermon by the late Dr. Alexander Whyte was published in 'The Christian Year.' It was from a new volume with the title *The Nature of Angels* (Hodder & Stoughton). The eight addresses which form the volume have been chosen by Mrs. Whyte from hitherto unpublished papers. The last address, 'Fullness of Joy,' which is the one we quoted, is included, she says, 'simply because I like it.' The others all deal with 'the relation of the human spirit to those great hierarchies which dominate the unseen world, and which have ever mediated its power and blessing, from the day when Jacob, sleeping on the pillow of stone, saw the angels of God ascending and descending upon a ladder which reached from earth to heaven, until Francis Thompson saw the "traffic"

> '’Twixt heaven and Charing Cross.'

Mrs. Whyte and the publishers have done wisely in offering this further selection to the public.

There has been a movement in the Free Churches for some time towards a more set form of public worship. To further this, a book of Common Worship has been published by the Kingsgate Press with the title, *Come, Let Us Worship* (2s. 6d.). In the preface to it the Rev. F. C. Spurr says: 'Public worship demands a richer expression than can be supplied by the traditional Nonconformist forms. This is . . . due rather to a sense of the larger content implied in the worship offered by men and women who would bring to God the best they have; and also to a conviction that in *corporate* worship mere passivity fails to express in an adequate manner that outgoing of the whole nature for which worship calls.' The book contains five complete services, and is based on a service book which was prepared almost forty years ago by a pioneer in the movement, the Rev. Henry Bonner.

Good News from God (Longmans; 3s. 6d. net) is the title of the Bishop of London's Lenten Sermons for 1930. They are a model of directness and simplicity, of evangelical fervour and persuasive address. Confessedly they are 'an appeal to the heart and conscience rather than an argument about the Church.' Yet they are packed with instruction and are fitted to stir in thoughtful minds a deeper sense of loyalty to Christ and His Church.

In a little book entitled *Studies in the Psalms*, I. (Milford; 5s. net), Dr. Samuel Daiches discusses some familiar Hebrew words and reaches conclusions which entirely subvert current interpretations. On the basis of a close examination of Pss 4, 11, 12, 14, 15 he argues that the phrase בני ארם nearly always means the rich, noble, or mighty, with the added connotation of wicked, therefore 'the wicked rich,' etc. An examination of Pss 9, 10, and other Old Testament passages yields the conclusion that אנוש means not 'weak man,' but 'strong man.' A study of Pss 7, 8, 9, Gn 12^2 20^4, etc., suggests that גוי is not 'nation' but 'nobleman,' and ארץ not 'the world' but 'the land.' Ps 2 is subjected to a specially detailed examination, with the result that all traces of world dominion disappear from the psalm, the גוים and לאמים being simply wicked nobles or overbearing lords, and the מלכי ארץ the petty kings of *the land* of Palestine (not 'the earth'). These conclusions are as radical as they are unconventional, they often alter the scale of the scenery, and, if substantiated, they would frequently compel considerable reinterpretation. The detailed argument therefore deserves the close attention of scholars.

The Gospel according to Saint Luke, by Mr. H. Balmforth, M.A., is a valuable and welcome addition to the excellent 'Clarendon Bible' series (Milford; 4s. 6d. net). To write a commentary 'with the object of meeting the requirements not only of the elder pupils in public schools, their teachers, students in training colleges, and others engaged in education, but also of the clergy, and the growing class of the general public which . . . takes an interest in Biblical studies,' is not an easy undertaking, but it is only just to say that Mr. Balmforth has succeeded better than any commentator on Luke's Gospel that we know. For the critical basis of his commentary he has freely drawn on the works of Canon Streeter and Dr. Vincent Taylor, but he has obviously studied the source problem closely himself, and has read widely over the whole subject of Lucan research. The text followed is that of the Revised Version, but the exegesis rests again and again upon a study of the original. Mr. Balmforth's method is to treat matters of historical and exegetical importance in detailed notes, and then to comment upon the various points of interest which arise in connexion with the text. The longer notes are especially valuable, notably the one on the Virgin Birth. The book is printed with all the art for which the Clarendon Press is famous, and is supplied with some thirty illustrations, including a plan of Herod's Temple and a map of Palestine. We wish the volume a richly deserved success.

The many to whom Apocalyptic is a sealed book should welcome the succinct and lucid account of it given by Mr. W. J. Ferrar, M.A., in *From Daniel to St. John the Divine* (S.P.C.K.; 3s. 6d. net). Beginning with Daniel, whose writer, he shows, was not solitary but one of a circle, he goes on to discuss the literature, such as Jubilees, between Daniel and the beginning of the Christian Era, a period of which he gives a brief historical sketch. Then he deals with the Jewish and Christian Apocalyptic of the first century A.D., for example, 2 Baruch, 4 Ezra, Jude, 2 Peter, Paul, after which he discusses the Book of Revelation, the Ascension of Isaiah, and the Apocalypse of Peter. Mr. Ferrar shows much adroitness in his selection of the sections of the Apocalyptic literature for discussion, and in his broad treatment of those sections. He does not bewilder his readers with a maze of detail, but fastens on the great thoughts or salient aspects of the various books: in Daniel, for example, on Individual Resurrection and Angelology, and in Enoch on the Son of Man. He happily explains Apocalyptic as a vehement reaction to persecution, and shows how disparate were often the expectations presented by the different books, Enoch pointing to the Elect and Righteous Son of Man, and the Psalms of Solomon to a Warrior-King. Particularly welcome to perplexed students of the Book of Revelation will be his brief but helpful treatment of that book, and especially, in view of its fiercer passages, by his emphasis upon it as an Apocalypse of Jesus Christ.

There are many ways of setting forth the Preparation for Christ in Hebrew history. We were familiar in our schooldays with so-called Messianic texts, many of which we now see to have been quite irrelevant to the purpose for which they were adduced, and we are familiar with the more modern approach which, in a larger way, sees in Jesus the fulfilment not of isolated predictions, but of the whole religious movement represented by Israel. It has been left, however, for Mr. A. D. Martin to take a way of his own, and a thoroughly original and persuasive way it is. His book, entitled *Foreshewings of Christ* (S.P.C.K.; 5s. net), is a series of meditations on ten characters of the Old Testament, which are exactly what they claim to be as indicated by the sub-title, 'Old Testament Studies in the Preparation for the Advent.' The full list of characters studied is as follows, and it will be admitted that it includes many surprises: Balaam, Joshua, Jephthah's daughter, Saul, Jeroboam I., Elisha, Hosea, Josiah, Jeremiah, and Job. Seldom indeed, if ever, can such a collocation of characters have appeared in studies on the historical preparation for Jesus. But Mr. Martin, by his magic touch and his unconventional treatment, makes them all genuinely contributory to that preparation. Obviously the work of a scholar, the book, which is enriched with apt quotations from a wide range of literature, is carefully and even beautifully written. There is nothing hackneyed here. The preacher who is on the outlook for a fresh and suggestive treatment of a great theme, when he lights upon this book, will assuredly not be disappointed.

We commend to the notice of the general reader, and especially to any who feel called to engage in controversy with Rome, *The Reformation, Catholicism, and Freedom*, by Mr. J. W. Poynter (S.P.C.K.; 6s. net). The author was apparently at one time a Roman Catholic, but is convinced that the claims of the Papacy to temporal as well as spiritual dominance and the intolerance of the system are unsound and inimical to human progress. A good deal of this scholarly work will be somewhat unpalatable to Protestants. It sets before us the sad story of Protestant intolerance and repression and persecution of Romanists. It does not justify Protestant intolerance, but it explains it as due to a well-founded fear of a return of that politico-religious tyranny from which the State had emancipated itself.

No one, we are told, reads sermons to-day, and unless they have a very distinctive note, such as Professor Gossip can strike, publishers are afraid to take the risk of publication. But there are sermons and sermons, and, where the long sermon is a terror, the short sermon has a chance. Of the short sermon the Rev. D. Gardner Miller, of Trinity Congregational Church, Christchurch, New Zealand, shows himself a master in *The Gates of Pain* (Stockwell; 2s. 6d. net). These brief meditations are refreshingly unconventional, shot through with gleams of imagination and rays of light upon life's dark and difficult places. The titles are striking without being sensational—'The Fire on the Beach,' 'Spiritual Economics'—and the meditations send the reader away with a new access of hope, strength, and refreshment of soul.

One of the volumes in a series to which we have already called attention a number of times might be specially singled out. It contains eight addresses by the Rev. Joseph Fort Newton with the title *Things I know in Religion* (Stockwell; 2s. 6d. net). Seven of the addresses appear here for the first time, the eighth one having been published already in the volume, 'If I had only One Sermon to Preach on Immortality.' Extracts from the first of these excellent addresses were given in 'The Christian Year' last month.

We would direct the attention both of the teachers and the students of Church History to a small book whose value bears no relation to its size—*The Inner History of the Great Schism of the West*, by the Rev. G. J. Jordan, D.D., D.Litt. (Williams & Norgate; 7s. 6d. net). The Schism is probably the most amazing event in all the annals of the Church. Its origin is mysterious, its effect on Christians of that age was desolating, its fruits were far-reaching. What makes it an almost baffling mystery to explain is the circumstance that there is such wide irreconcilable difference of statement among contemporary writers. Cardinals flatly contradict one another and not seldom themselves. Dr. Jordan has made an intensive and extensive study of all contemporary literature that bears on the subject; and with masterly judgment and conciseness sets before us an intelligible and credible narrative of the complicated series of events from the breach to its healing.

We are convinced that he is right both in his reconstruction of what happened, and in his view that the Great Schism ought to form a preliminary study to any history of the Reformation, with which it stands, in his view, in the same relation as the porch to the house. Dr. Jordan would have us regard the healing of the Schism as a problem of Church Unity; and would draw the lesson that the like qualities which overcame an apparently hopeless situation then will avail now to conquer the apparently irreconcilable divergences which keep Christians apart in our day. Frankly, we are not so greatly impressed by that. After all, there is little analogy between the Schism and our present situation. At that time all were in agreement as to several very important points on which we are now poles asunder.

We heartily welcome a fresh reprint of the English translation of Wilhelm Herrmann's great classic, *The Communion of the Christian with God* (Williams & Norgate; 6s. net). Strictly speaking, the new volume is more than a reprint, for the translation of J. S. Sandys Stanyon, M.A., has been revised throughout, and enlarged and altered in accordance with the fourth German edition of 1903, by the Rev. R. W. Stewart, B.D., B.Sc. The additions amount to nearly a tenth part of the whole book.

The Purpose of Deuteronomy, Chapter vi.

By Professor Adam C. Welch, D.D., New College, Edinburgh.

Apart from two minor additions, this chapter is a unity, dealing with a single theme. The two additions are v.[14] and vv.[16f.], both of which rouse suspicion through using the 2nd plur. form of address in a 2nd sing. section. In each case the contents confirm the suspicion. Thus, while v.[13] bids the people fear and serve Yahweh and use no other name in their solemn oaths, v.[14] forbids them to follow strange gods borrowed from their heathen neighbours. It is, of course, true that this forms a just conclusion from the previous command, and one which refers it to their situation. But it is also true that, by selecting one specific duty, and especially by turning it into a negative form, the verse unduly limits the scope of the original precept. The command to love and serve Yahweh sounds the large, positive note which is heard in v.[7], where the people are reminded that their whole life must be informed with a reverent love to their God. Both emphasize that the Jewish faith concerns the whole of conduct: v.[14] merely forbids apostasy.

Vv.[16f.], again, warn the people against tempting Yahweh as they had done at Massah, and so introduce a reference to the incident mentioned at Ex 17[2. 7]. But not only do the verses interrupt the connexion by using this reference: the illustration to which they refer is not appropriate to the situation. For the preceding vv.[10-12] have been warning the people against the dangers which attend sudden success. They must be on their guard lest, through inheriting the built towns and dug wells, the planted vineyards and olive groves of Canaan, they be tempted into forgetfulness of the faith which gave the vigour and the unity which were essential for that victory. Now the fretfulness, by which the men tried their God at Massah, was due, not to success or abundance, but to sheer need. What drove men there to complain, so far from being ready-dug wells, was the want of water.

After removing these three verses, however, there is no sufficient reason for regarding vv.[2-25] as anything except the work of one mind. Yet again Steuernagel and Hempel, who have divided chapter 5, divide this also, assigning vv.[20-25] to a later date and a different author.[1] Their chief reason is that these verses imply the existence of the Code, while the earlier verses make no reference to it as already in existence. So far as concerns vv.[20-25], the statement is obviously true. The little section speaks about ḥuqqim and mishpatim, which are the terms used to describe the Code in chapter 5. Besides, the direction given is only conceivable if such a Code existed. It would not be possible for fathers to instruct their children in the meaning of certain practices of the common faith, unless the boys were witnessing the acts and the rituals, in the meaning of which they were to be instructed. One may even go further and say that the section implies not merely the existence of a series of regulations, but the existence of the actual institutions and rituals which the Code was framed to set up and to regulate. The boys are to be instructed in the purpose of certain practices which they were witnessing.

But, while the existence of the Code is not so definitely stated in the earlier sections of the chapter, it is quite as clearly implied there. Thus in vv.[10ff.] the writer warns his people against the dangers which attend success and which arise from the intoxication of the possession of the good things which are to become theirs. That warning was plainly addressed to a later generation. The man was speaking to men of a later time who had inherited the advantages which had come from their fathers' devotion to the national cause through the inspiration of their religion. He knew how easy it is to inherit the outward benefits and to let slip the fine qualities which won these outward goods. The situation he envisages is a familiar phenomenon in connexion with every strong ethical impulse or religious movement which has laid hold on a community. Indeed, it is not confined to the case of religion. Is there not a Yorkshire proverb which allows three or four generations from clogs to clogs, and so grimly acknowledges the ease with which men inherit a good business and a new status, but fail to inherit the enterprise and the industry which went to the winning of these? The writer has seen the danger which has threatened the distinctive character of his own people through this constant factor in life. But to a man who wrote thus the faith, which gave the people this distinctive character and which had been the nerve of the first generation's success, was already known. It already existed, and he was jealously insisting that it must not be lost.

---

[1] This is apart from some minor sentences which may here be ignored.

Accordingly, there is a close relation between vv.$^{10\text{ff.}}$ and vv.$^{20\text{ff.}}$, a relation which Steuernagel and Hempel have failed to recognize, because they have not grasped the full import of the earlier section. There is only one means of bridging the gap between the generations, only one means of making sure that the finest possession of one generation shall pass into the possession of those who inherit its other gains. That is education. Therefore, the writer insists, it is the task of the elders to transmit their best possession to their children. Their best possession is the knowledge of their distinctive Jewish faith. Hence he bids the fathers instruct their sons in the ḥuqqim and mishpatim which constitute that faith. The fathers already know these. But in both passages the content of this specific faith in its distinctiveness and its power is already recognized.

Again, the earlier vv.$^{4-9}$, which contain the famous Sh'ma, are intended to develop two leading ideas. The one is that Yahweh, the God of Israel, is one in the sense that He is unique, the only God for the nation. The other is that the right religious attitude of every true Israelite is reverent love. But these two large utterances take for granted a great deal. Thus they take for granted that the people know who Yahweh is and what there is in His character, and especially in His relation to them, which makes Him unique to them. The passage assumes that every Israelite knows the record of the deliverance from Egypt and the covenant at Horeb which constitute the basis of their national faith. So entirely does the writer take this knowledge for granted that he does not preface the Sh'ma even with the brief introduction which appears before the commands of the Decalogue in 5^6: 'I am Yahweh thy God who brought thee out of the land of Egypt, the house of slaves.' He is basing upon the admitted foundations of the faith and does not find it necessary to repeat them.

In the same way he urges the people to cherish a reverent love to their God and to bring this right temper into association with all their life, so that everything in their life may be controlled by its influence. All they do is to be hallowed to finer issues by the sense that it can become a loving service of their God. But the man who could write in such terms was already conscious that his religion concerned itself with a man's going in and going out, his lying down and rising up. He could and did take it for granted that his people realized that the Yahweh faith had to do with the whole of a man's conduct at home and abroad. Only the way in which men fulfilled these constant demands of their religion could be and ought to be fulfilled with the temper of reverent love to Him who exacted them all. Without this their obedience would lose its full content to themselves and to Yahweh, to whom it was rendered.

What the writer was pressing on the attention of his people can be well recognized from an example taken from the Code itself. Chapter $15^{12\text{ff.}}$ orders a master to set free his Hebrew slave in the seventh year, and requires that at the time of the emancipation he shall liberally supply the newly freed with an equipment which shall enable the man to face his independent life and make a hopeful fresh start. Not content with this, the law continues that the master must do this in no grudging spirit. Let him remember that he owes to the Divine grace the fact of his own freedom: thou wast a slave in the land of Egypt and the Lord thy God redeemed thee. His religion is to be of such a quality that it goes beyond a mere sour obedience to the letter of the law. But such a demand is only made from men who know the letter of the law.

That is the attitude of the writer of vv.$^{4\text{ff.}}$, Israel has its own way of life determined by its Divine law. The man does not repeat the content of this law in precept and ordinance, any more than he halted to say why Yahweh had the right to the entire allegiance of His people. He insisted on the gracious temper which could make beautiful and worthy all the obedience exacted from Israel. And this temper sprang from a full understanding of the religion which required the obedience, for its fundamental principle was loving gratitude to Yahweh in the recognition of His grace to Israel. But a man who wrote in these terms had behind him the thought of a religion which, because it demanded so much, could easily be made into a heavy yoke instead of being construed as a means by which gratitude was manifested. The attitude of the writer takes the knowledge of the Code for granted, as it takes a knowledge of Israel's relation to Yahweh for granted.

It is natural that he, who has been requiring love to God, should continue in v.^{13} by speaking in the same breath of the fear of God. The one does not at all exclude the other, for the fear of Yahweh is simply the practical side of his religion. It means the avoidance of everything which might kindle the Divine anger, and the constant service of the Divine will. It is indeed the religion which concerns itself with a man's conduct at home and abroad (v.^{7}). And this in all its practical demands and in its wide reach of restraint and constraint is to be informed with the love of God. Vv.[7.13] are engaged on the same theme.

The author sees the entire life of his nation to rest on the unique character of the God who claims the entire devotion to Israel. All who know what He has been to them must give Him reverent love. But Israel's life is concerned with the way men conduct their affairs at home and abroad, and in every detail they ought to serve and fear their God there. But this life can only be rightly and worthily carried on, when all its obedience is seen to be love's claim on a grateful heart. Whenever men forget God, their whole way of life, even in the land of their God's gift, drops to a lower level. It becomes a wallowing in the good things of Canaan. The people must, accordingly, be on their guard against the dangers of success with its attendant self-reliance. To prevent such a weakening of the national fibre, the elders must make it their business to help their children to recognize their spiritual as well as their physical heritage. The younger generation must be trained to see that Israel's way of life derives directly from the character of Him whom they worship. Its passover festival is a reminder of what Yahweh did for His people at the Exodus. Its law-courts are conducted after the principles of a Divine righteousness. Its king is one who rules as the servant of Yahweh, and who submits to Him while he governs others. All the distinctive features of the national life into which the boy grows up owe their origin to convictions which ultimately derive from the fact that the God whom the people worship is unique in His nature.

What the writer of the chapter has to say is contained in his opening sentences: Hear, O Israel, the Lord our God is unique, and thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy mind, and with all thy strength. All the positive religion which guides and controls the life of the nation has for its norm the character of Him who has revealed it; and the nation's obedience only remains sweet and wholesome when its motive is grateful love to this God. The writer does not stop to say how men are to learn the character of the God they worship, nor how they become acquainted with the terms of the obedience which He demands. He takes it for granted that both are known, since he expects the parents to be able to teach these matters to their sons. The chapter is a unity. Vv.[4.5] give its dominant ideas: the rest is corollary.

There can be no question as to the source from which this has been derived. Its author has been at school with the two prophets, Amos and Hosea, and has imbibed their teaching. Amos told the men of his time that the root of their sin was that they took possession of the land of the Amorites which Yahweh had given, but stifled the warning voices of the prophets whom He had sent to teach them how they were to live there (2^{12}). Hosea declared that, when they came to Baal Peor, they became abominable like the thing they loved (9^{10}). They took the corn and the wine of the land into which Yahweh brought them and forgot the Giver (ch. 2). They imagined mischief against Him who had strengthened their arms (7^{15}). Steuernagel has pointed out that the idea of love to Yahweh as fundamental in the national religion is unique in the Hexateuch, and has recognized in it the characteristic teaching of Hosea. He might have added that the same prophet lays equal stress on the need for a right knowledge of Yahweh. His complaint against priest and people is that they do not really know their God ($4^{1.6}$). They do not recognize His true nature, and, lacking this, they fail to give Him the grateful love which could not but rise from their acknowledgment of what He is and what He has done for them. Through this failure their national life has lost its distinctive character and sunk to the same level as that of other peoples. Ephraim has become mixed among the nations (7^8): they are among the nations as a vessel in which there can be no pleasure (8^8). In their present temper they do not need more or better laws: though Yahweh multiplied His statutes, these would only seem to them idle things (8^{12}). They need a radical change of outlook.

The author of this chapter is applying these prophetic ideals to the actual Code by which the people were required to live. Not merely in vv.[20-25], but throughout, he has the Code before him. As the author of chap. 5 had Decalogue and Code before him and tried to define the relation between these two, so this writer has the entire religion of his nation in his mind, and insists on its fundamental principles. Because, however, he does not think of Decalogue and Code as separate constituents of this religion, but sees this to be one whole, he is more careless in his language. Chapter 5 distinguishes between the d'bharim of the Decalogue and the ḥuqqim and mishpatim of the positive religion. Chapter 6 speaks of ḥuqqoth and mitzwoth (v.[2]), describes the religion which is taught to the children as made up of ʿedōth, ḥuqqim, and mishpatim (v.[20]), but is content to describe the same subject in the same connexion by ḥuqqim (v.[24]). The purpose of the two writers has inevitably influenced their language.

The one, who was making a distinction between two constituents of Israel's religion, needed to choose his terms with care. The other, who was thinking of his faith in its unity, could afford to be more lax in his language.

But all this implies that the chapter, like its predecessor, is later than the Code with the fundamental principles of which it deals. Further, it also derives from North Israel. Not only are the principles which it applies to the Code those of the two prophets of the North. But even the annotator who added in vv.[16f.] the reference to Massah used for the purpose the version of E in Ex $17^{2.7}$ as contrasted with J's account. It is more difficult, however, to determine what may have been the original connexion to which the passage belonged. It certainly forms no part of the surroundings among which it has been placed. Thus v.[2] cannot be read as a continuation of v.[1]. Not only is there the sudden, unaccountable change over from 2nd plur. to 2nd sing. But v.[1] speaks of a commandment, consisting of statutes and judgments: v.[2] speaks of statutes and commandments, and in mentioning statutes makes it feminine, while v.[1] makes it masculine. It is impossible to believe that the same person wrote those two verses in a continuous sentence. But that leaves v.[2] hanging in the air, a half-sentence, since it begins with 'in order that.' Either it has once been connected with some other passage, or it has been inserted where it stands in order to create a tolerable connexion with what precedes. It were rash, on the basis of these two chapters, to decide where chapter 6 originally appeared. Only it should be added that it has very much the appearance of never having been intended for an introduction to the Code. Its more appropriate place would be at the close of the law, since it does not give the impression of leading up to anything. Or, if it leads up to anything, it is rather to the institution of a system of education, than to a statement of the law. One could conceive of the chapter, even more readily than of chap. 5, having been a piece of religious literature which gathered round the Code, and which proved how that Code had appealed to the religious thought of the prophets, and how these in turn had developed and deepened its teaching.

In the Study.

Virginibus Puerisque.

Under New Management.

By the Reverend Philip E. Pegg, Scarborough.

'By their fruits ye shall know them.'—Mt 7^{20}.

The other day while I was walking along the street I caught sight of a large notice outside a shop. It said: 'This business is now under entirely new management.' I expect you have seen a notice like that pasted on the windows of a good many shops; sometimes a sweet-shop, sometimes a toy-shop, sometimes a boot-shop, sometimes a grocer's shop. I suppose that almost every kind of shop there is, at some time or other, somewhere, has had that notice: 'Under new management.'

I wonder why the people had put that notice outside the shop. Well, it was the best way of letting people know that a different person was in charge of the business. It wouldn't have been much use, would it? if the owner of the shop stood outside and, as the people passed, went up to them and said, 'Excuse me—this shop is now under entirely new management.' If he had done that he would soon have had a policeman come and tell him that he was obstructing the traffic—which is the policeman's way of saying 'getting in the way.' But the owner of the shop wasn't as foolish as that. He put the large notice outside and then everybody could see for themselves.

Now I wonder why he wanted the people to know that the shop had a new manager. I suppose it was because the man who had had it before wasn't a very good man. Perhaps his goods hadn't been the right sort—the right quality, grown-up people would say. Or, perhaps, he charged too much. We think that is true of most shops, don't we? At any rate I expect the business hadn't gone very well before—there hadn't been very many customers. People had come perhaps and not been treated very nicely and had gone away and not come any more. The new man wanted them to know that that would not happen now, and if they came they would be treated nicely and be able to buy the things they wanted at the prices they could afford to pay. So to attract new customers and get back old ones he put out the notice: 'This business is now under entirely new management.'

But supposing things weren't very different after all; it wouldn't matter how many notices he put outside, the people would soon find out that things were just as bad as they were before and they would start going again to other shops for the things they wanted. The only way to prove that the shop really was under entirely new and better management would be to give the people good value for their money. It reminds us of what Jesus once said, 'By their fruits ye shall know them.'

That brings us to Jesus. Now what has the shop under new management got to do with you and me and Jesus? Quite a lot. You see when we say that we are going to love and follow Jesus it means that we are going to be under entirely new and better management. There are lots of people who do that and tell other people about it. But people soon find out whether it is real or not. It is only as we do the things that Jesus would have us do—not lose our temper, or be selfish, or say or do unkind things—that people will know that it is really true that Jesus is our Master and Saviour and that we are under His management.

The Get-Away Gecko.

By the Reverend H. L. Picken, Wolverhampton.

'Wherefore if thy hand or thy foot offend thee, cut them off, and cast them from thee.'—Mt 18[8].

I wonder if any of you know what a Gecko is? You don't? Well then, let me introduce you. He is a funny little chap, but very useful too. He belongs to a very big family. His cousin, whether second or fortieth I'm not sure, is the Crocodile, and another cousin of his is the Chameleon, the little fellow who alters the colour of his suit to the colour of whatever place he happens to find himself in. And then the little Gecko's great-great-great-grandfather was a most fearsome monster of gigantic size, with a name nearly as long as himself—the Proterosauros. But the little Gecko is the humblest member of this great family—the Lizard family.

Let me tell you some of the things that he does. He lives in the tropics. He is to be found in almost every house in a country like India. He lives on the walls and is to be found lurking behind the pictures, from which every now and again he will suddenly dart after a fly or tiny insect. He has wonderful little padded feet with which he can run up and down the walls or upside down on the ceiling. He has a long tongue which he shoots out, like a cowboy's lasso, only much quicker, and flicks in a fly in a wink.

This is why every one welcomes the little Gecko to their home. He helps to get rid of the mosquitoes and flies.

There is another clever thing that he can do. You would never guess what it is. If any one tries to catch him, should they succeed in getting hold of his tail—why, he let's his tail go and runs off to grow another one. That is why I have called him the Get-away Gecko. He loses his tail, yes, but he saves his life!

Does that remind you of anything? Does it remind you of some words that Jesus once spake? Do you remember He said, 'If thy hand or thy foot causeth thee to stumble, cut it off?'

Perhaps you think that a strange thing for Jesus to say. Surely He did not mean that if our hand or our foot was likely to cause us to do something wrong or to come to harm that we were actually to cut it off?

No, I do not think so, but it was just a very striking way of saying that if our hand or our foot, or for that matter any member of our body, eyes, ear, or mouth were likely to cause us to do wrong or to come into harm, IT WERE BEST THAT WE SHOULD ACT AS THOUGH THEY WERE ACTUALLY CUT OFF.

That is to say, we should behave as if we hadn't a hand to do the wrong, or a foot to carry us into harm, or an eye to see, or an ear to hear evil things, or a mouth to speak wrong.

So next time something wrong comes lurking round to catch you—something we call Temptation, remember our little friend the Get-away Gecko who loses his tail to save his life, and act as if you hadn't a hand, or foot, an eye or an ear, or a mouth to be caught by.

The Christian Year.

Fifteenth Sunday after Trinity.

Real and Unreal Religion.

'And when the people were come into the camp, the elders of Israel said, Wherefore hath the Lord smitten us to-day before the Philistines? Let us fetch the ark of the covenant of the Lord out of Shiloh unto us, that, when it cometh among us, it may save us out of the hand of our enemies.'—1 S 4[3].

'Seek ye first the kingdom of God, and his righteousness; and all these things shall be added unto you.'—Mt 6[33].

It was a very dark hour for the people of Israel. The trouble was that they had fallen away from a real religion. They did not know what was wrong with them, though they knew that something was badly wrong. The one hopeful moment was when they began to ask the reason, and to probe down to the roots of their weakness. 'Wherefore hath the Lord smitten us to-day before our enemies?' There is hope for a nation even in its blackest hour, if it begin to ask questions like these, and to examine whether or not it has fallen out of the grace of God.

The thoughts of the Israelites turned to the ark of the covenant, the symbol of God's presence in their midst. The ark served a very useful purpose—the same purpose as the presence of a church in a busy street. It reminded them of God, their true leader, and that they could never get anywhere that was worth getting to unless they were in touch with Him. But religion had fallen so low that they identified the ark of God with God's presence and power, as if, somehow, it contained Him; and they felt that, if only they brought it on to the field of battle, this box of wood and gold would save them from defeat. So they brought the ark of God on to the field of battle. But all in vain.

This story stands to teach us something of what religion really means, and what it does not mean.

1. The first mistake they made was in identifying the presence of God with this wooden box. It had become to them a sacred thing, a fetish, an object which they imagined secured to them, just because it was there, the help and favour of God. To-day we have our sacred places; churches, altars, even our sacred officials. There is a tendency, if we do not think clearly, to identify these with the presence of God. The result is a false reverence and a misplaced devotion for some things, while we tend to secularise others and consign them to the sphere of what is common and non-religious. For instance, we call our churches sacred, but the result may be to treat our homes and offices and factories as secular. We may consider our pulpits sacred and feel that truth should be spoken there, while we look on the platform as secular, and are, perhaps, not so particular about our utterances there. And so life may unconsciously be divided up into sacred and secular. The whole distinction is false. The truly sacred thing is personality, and what belongs to it. Love and righteousness are sacred; truth is sacred. There is only one sacred kind of action, and that is the right action. There is only one sacred place, and that is the place in which we meet with God, which may be every place. There is only one sacred message, and that is the message of truth, whoever speaks it. A church may help us, through its associations; it may constrain our minds, through its beauty or symbolism, to think about God—but it cannot, of itself, bring us into touch with God, for God dwells in the heart. His Spirit finds abode in our souls; in all true thoughts we think; in the impulses to goodness and right that spring up within us; and in the souls of other people whom we can help and who can help us. It is thus we find God, or we do not find Him at all. Our reverence should be given to the right thing; to the purpose of God for which He bids us live; to the souls which God has given us; to the people whom we can help or love. These are sacred.

The second mistake these people made is one that naturally follows from this misplaced reverence. They imagined that, in bringing the ark upon the field of battle, they were bringing God to their side. They rightly believed that nothing could stand against God, if only they could persuade Him to act, but they imagined that the ark itself would perform the miracle.

What should they have done? They knew that something was wrong; they should have asked themselves what it was. They should have looked into their lives to see if their hearts were set on seeking what God would have them seek. They should have asked if they were living in a spirit of righteousness. They should have fallen on their knees in a great humility, and asked to be shown His will, that they might do it. They should have besought Him to bring them back to such a true sense of His love and care as would compel them to trust in Him and in His strength, and lead them to walk by the guidance of conscience. No doubt, at the moment, all this was beyond them. Their thoughts were steeped in superstition. What they did was, perhaps, the best they could do at their stage; but it was useless, as they discovered, and later on they learnt the better way.

2. The point for us is that real religion consists in getting into right relations with God. And this incident has meaning for us. Whenever we are faced with trouble, whether in business, or in the home, or in any other part of our life, when times are out of joint, we know in our hearts that there

are things which only God can put right. The message of all trouble is that we should open our hearts to Him. Has selfishness been eating into our hearts? Has some sin or wrong way of life been fastening its tentacles, like a poisonous thing, in our spirit, and sucking away our moral stamina? The way back is to be willing to set things right; it is to see His love for us, pouring itself around us like a great flood, and to ask for grace to respond to it—for grace to set right our relations with other people. The way of God's help is the way of His fellowship, and the way of His fellowship is the way of every other kind of fellowship; it is through the harmony of our mind and will with His. 'Grant that we may never seek,' prayed Augustine, 'to bend the straight to the crooked, that is Thy will to ours, but help us to bend the crooked to the straight, that is our will to Thine.' The same thing is true of our national life. There is something unreal in the appointment of days of prayer in national emergencies, unless through that prayer we are seeking to be open to God's light. The only true approach to God is by the sincerity that asks to be shown the right way of life for each of us in our own place in the community, and for the nation as a whole; and if our hearts are open, and all our cards are on the table—to use a commonplace metaphor—and all our prejudices in the melting-pot, then we shall find the way of hope, for we shall find God.

It is a question, in point of fact, whether we shall ever get the help we need in any particular trouble, so long as we are mainly concerned with the trouble. For the trouble is often only the symptom that something is wrong, and no wise physician ever thinks he can cure a trouble by tackling the symptoms. There are people, for instance, who seek God's help in a temptation. They pray, and nothing happens. The real reason is that they are seeking the help of God for an ideal of their own self-respect, not for the sake of the kingdom of God. In a way, they are seeking to exploit the grace of God for a purpose of their own. And the only way in which they can find deliverance is by a self-forgetfulness that seeks for the service they can do—a service to which God is calling them. Then they discover that the habit is broken by the expulsive power of a new purpose, a new affection that casts out the obsessing selfishness.

3. God's help is in His fellowship, shaping us into the kind of people He wants us to be, and into the use He is able to make of us through His guiding and our obedience. The trouble with many people is that they are more concerned about God's help than they are about His fellowship; they are more intent on their own advantages, or their own deliverance, than they are on His will. That is where an unreal religion has its roots. We are more anxious that God should be on our side than that we should be on His. It may be that if these Israelites had taken the right way, and had asked for God's guiding, seeking to know His will—it may be that they would have found a new strength to overcome their enemies; for a clean heart and a right spirit are the real springs of intellectual and physical vitality.

But, again, it may not so happen. The trouble may not be escaped. The Israelites might have been defeated just the same. But here is the point—they would have been able to face their defeat; they would have had the right attitude to it; they would have found God in it, and so in defeat would have been victorious; even as Jesus was victorious on the Cross, although He died on it. Through their defeat they would have found the larger victory.

There is no necessary connexion between an untroubled life and a quiet conscience, a fact which the people of the Old Testament never could understand, but which the Cross made plain. When James Smetham, the artist, poet, and essayist, who spent most of his life in poverty, was asked why he went to church on Sunday he replied, 'To get a blessing.' 'And what is a blessing?' his friend asked. Whereupon Smetham replied, 'Removal of the temptation to rage, and scorn, and indignation; a sweetness; a satisfaction with my lot; a content with God's dealings. I went to chapel to-day, fretted with plenty of dark and vexing suggestions. I came away calm, sweet, fresh, all my cares gone, rejoicing in the God of my salvation, and I think no one is more happy than I. That is a blessing, and yet I know no more than I did at 7 p.m. who is going to buy my pictures, my poems, or my essays.'

There is only one true worship: it is the offering of our hearts to be God's temple. There is only one really sacred service: it is to do His will in daily life and serve His children. There is only one sacred place: it is in His world, where we may find His voice everywhere, and so find it hallowed with love and beauty. There is only one true prayer: it is the prayer that begins, whatever it contains, and ends with this petition, 'Create in me a clean heart, O God, and renew a right spirit within me.'[1]

---

[1] J. Reid, *In Touch with Christ*, 148.

Sixteenth Sunday after Trinity.

The Cross and the Lesson of Sin.

'Herein is love . . . that he sent his Son to be the propitiation for our sins.'—1 Jn 4[10].

1. At the foot of the Cross, let us consider the character of sin. According to the often quoted words of Sir Oliver Lodge, 'The higher man of to-day is not worrying about his sins at all, still less about their punishment.' Perhaps the words not unfairly describe the attitude of the average man. The average, well-intentioned, moral man is not troubling about sin. He prides himself on cultivating a 'religion of healthy-mindedness.' The self-examining, the self-despising, the self-loathing of the saints he thinks foolish and old-fashioned.

To the average man with his cheerful and shallow persuasions—so attractive at first sight, so inadequate when examined—let us venture to repeat the solemn warning of St. Anselm, 'Thou has not considered what weight sin hath.'

What, then, is the revelation of the Cross concerning sin? Well, in the first place, looking at sin as the occasion of the Cross, as the cause which brought it about and made it necessary, we learn that sin is something which emphatically ought not to be. It cannot be, therefore, a part of us which belongs to our God-given nature. It must be an intrusion into us, a violation of that nature. 'Two things,' writes Lancelot Andrewes—'two things I acknowledge in myself, O Lord: nature which Thou hast made, sin which I have added.' Yes, nature and sin are two things and not one. And if this indeed be so—if sin be thus not natural, not in the line of our appointed tendency—then it follows that sin cannot be an element that is needed for our development.

What is this something which ought not to be? 'Sin,' says Martin Luther, 'is essentially a departure from God.' The sinner says No to God's love and God's purpose for his life. And while he says No to God, he says Yes to the meretricious world that antagonizes God. 'My sin was just this,' writes St. Augustine in his *Confessions*, 'that I sought for pleasures, grandeurs, realities, not in Him but in His creatures, myself, and others.'

Precisely inasmuch as sin is alienation from God, it is also a mortal injury to our own life and being. For man was made for fellowship with God, was meant to find his life, his moral self, his personality in Him. Hence sin, which severs the bond between the soul and God, destroys the connexion between the soul and life. It diverts from the soul the necessary stream of health. It deprives it of its nourishment. It cuts it off from the one thing in the universe that can make it strong and free. 'Death itself,' says a Father of the Church, 'is not to love God.'

2. Let us turn next to the problem of the deliverance from sin. What may we learn about this from the Master who teaches us as He dies upon the Cross?

Now at the present time, among those who are deeply conscious of the gravity of sin, and who have meditated deeply on the question of deliverance, but who yet for some reason hold back from the redemption of the Cross, there appear to be two parties. The first is the party of optimism. They tell us: There is a deliverance, and you can win it for yourselves. Cultivate admiration for what is beautiful and excellent. Exercise your will and burst your hateful fetters. Will this theory work? Let us think of St. Augustine's ineffectual struggles before his great conversion. Or of Luther in the monastery, and the exceeding bitter cry, 'My sin, my sin, my sin!' Let us consult our own experience. Has our disharmony ever brought forth harmony? Have we ever been able by mere exercise of will to achieve, not merely self-control in outward deeds, but a radical alteration of the principles of our nature?

There is another party—the party of pessimism. The doctrine of this school is that there is no deliverance either from sin or from its consequences. That is the teaching of much of our finest literature. We find it, for example, in George Eliot's *Adam Bede*, with its melancholy conclusion that 'there's a sort of wrong that can never be made up for.'

Let us turn once again to the Cross, and ask what solution this offers of the problem of deliverance.

A doctrine of the Atonement is neither precisely formulated in Holy Scripture nor defined with exactness by the universal Church. Christ's death, it has been felt, involves a mystery—something which goes beyond all illustrations and analogies, and of which all human explanations must of necessity be inadequate. Thus it is spoken of elusively, in figures and in metaphors. It is the Good Shepherd giving His life for the sheep. It is the Friend dying for His friends. It is the Son of Man offering Himself a ransom for you and me. This much, however, in the various representations, seems to stand out clear. Christ died in order to deliver us from sin—not merely to free us from the punishment of sin, not merely to avert the natural consequences of sin, but to abolish sin itself, to annul the estrangement between ourselves and God, and with it the spiritual death which is its issue and result. Yes, somewhere in the Cross there is a marvellous saving efficacy; a real overcoming of evil, a real uprooting of wrong, a real relief, a real deliverance, a real restoration to freedom and life and righteousness and God.

So we are taught. But does this teaching tally with the facts of our experience? We come to the Cross, and at the Cross we see revealed, as is nowhere else revealed, what God's love for us must be. Robert Browning once remarked in a private conversation, 'The evidence of Divine power is everywhere about us; not so the evidence of Divine love.' And the saying, perhaps, is true. We may not discern love's handiwork in the arrangements of the universe. Yet we cannot be mistaken as to the meaning of the Cross. Here, I repeat, we see what God's love is. We see what its reality is. We see what its capacity is. We see what it will do for us, what it has done in our case. 'Herein is love,' says St. John . . . 'that he sent his Son to be the propitiation for our sins.' In one of the churches of Italy there is a very remarkable representation of the Crucifixion. Behind the Christ on the Cross there is sketched the dim figure of the eternal Father; the Father's hands are behind the hands of the Son, and the nails which pierce the Son are piercing the Father also. No doubt the design is crude, but the artist's idea is the right one—that God was in Christ, suffering and travailing to reconcile us to Himself. In the visible sacrifice that was offered up on Calvary there was wonderfully working the Divine consummate love—not the mere royal clemency that issues from afar a pardon that costs nothing, not the immoral affection that smiles upon the sinner without troubling to ensure that his break with sin be certain, but the love which stoops down to us and suffers for our sakes, the love which endures the agony on our behalf, the love which does all to win us, which sinks to the deepest depth, which goes to the furthest limit, which makes the most awful sacrifice, out of the horrors of crucifixion pleading with us for acceptance, crying to each, Come back to me, my child; 'My son, give me thine heart.' And it is just the assurance of this almost incredible love that becomes in our experience a real energy of salvation. It breaks the spell of sin. We cannot bear any more to be estranged from such a God, or to be identified with a world which opposes such a God. There is a great recoil from evil; a sudden awakening from the night of our corruption. We feel the cleansing, purifying, regenerating power of a higher affection—and we can say with St. Augustine, 'Thou didst cast out my sins by coming in Thyself, Thou greater Sweetness.'[1]

SEVENTEENTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

The Necessity of Desire.

'He hath filled the hungry with good things.'—Lk 1[53].

There are a great many divergent views as to the nature of the poem from which this phrase is taken. It is, of course, very familiar to us under the traditional name of 'The Magnificat,' and as such has found an intimate place in the Church's worship through the centuries. But it is about the nature of the poem in its original use that different views have been formed. In the Gospel it is represented as coming from the lips of the mother of our Lord, and there are those who are content to regard it as a spontaneous outpouring of the heart of the Virgin. To others it appears as too fixed in its form to be a spontaneous utterance at all. If it be true that it is an early Jewish hymn, there is no difficulty in the way of believing that it came from the lips of Mary herself, for it would be quite natural for her feelings to clothe themselves in familiar words, made sacred as well as familiar by long use.

That the poem goes back to older sources is further evidenced by the ground it covers. It deals with a much wider field than merely personal experience. Its range includes the whole spirit of God's dealings with mankind; 'His mercy is on them that fear him from generation to generation. He hath shewed strength with his arm. He hath scattered the proud in the imagination of their hearts. He hath put down the mighty from their seats, and exalted them of low degree. He hath filled the hungry with good things, and the rich he hath sent empty away.'

It has always been true that God has brought down the mighty from their seats; always true that the proud have been scattered, that His mercy has been on them that fear Him, that the hungry have been filled and the rich sent empty away. These are things which any generation can see happening before its eyes, if it has the insight to understand and interpret the events of the time.

'He hath filled the hungry with good things,' and 'the rich he hath sent empty away,' is but the reverse side of the same truth. As we read it now, it may sound like a harsh discrimination against a certain class, but it has no such intention as that. It is merely that the rich are often the contented, with no great hunger for the things which God has to give. There is no question of class or economic distinction at all; it is a question of life motive and spirit. The hungry are not necessarily those in stark material need; in fact, when a man is hungry in that elemental sense his thought is inevitably fixed on material things. There is the pathetic materialism of poverty as well as the coarser materialism of wealth and luxury. But the contrast drawn here is between those who are for ever seeking the deeper meaning and resources of life, and those who are blindly contented with their present measure of experience. It is this spiritual law on the widest scale that the sentence brings before us—that before the vessel of the human heart is filled by God there must be hunger, eagerness of desire, passion of seeking, heartfelt prayer.

---

[1] F. H. Dudden, *Christ and Christ's Religion*, 96.

This is the groundwork of the spiritual life in all ages and lands. There are no instances of any of the great discoveries coming to dulled minds and inert hearts. The measure of human desire is the limit of God's power to bestow. This truth is at the root of the whole philosophy of prayer. 'Why does God wait for prayer before He bestows?' some one asks, and they go on to point out that even on the lower levels of human love we do not wait to give to our children until they ask for the gift. But in the deepest sense of the word we are as powerless to give the greatest things to our child until he hungers for them as God is powerless to give to us.

The greatest joy a father or mother has is to see the stirring in their child's heart of that eagerness, to see the passion for knowledge developing, or the taste for the beautiful. Indeed, is it not true that the secret of training any life committed to our care is to stimulate the appetite for the greatest things. It is the task of the parent, the teacher, and the preacher together. So it is that as the great Father looks down on His earthly children He has to wait for that same hunger to develop before He can give. Without it God is as powerless to bestow as we are powerless to give our child a thing for which he has no desire. Need and desire are the measure of our capacity to receive in every aspect of life. Behind all progress is hunger.

Now if this is a truth attested by the experience of men we must watch ourselves to guard against any flagging of desire. It is a danger which belongs peculiarly to the religious life. The most hopeless problem we have to deal with is not the mystery of things withheld from our grasp, but the mystery of things desired no longer. Can any one of us feel that the strength of our longings for the highest things is sufficient to bring them to us? Is the hunger there? That is the only decisive question in life. There are, indeed, mysteries about things long sought for but strangely denied, that some souls are dumb with disappointment, but we have never yet found that any one went through life with the passion to get to the heart of things who did not find an answer—not always the answer that was sought for, but sometimes far greater and richer.

We will not claim that every particular hunger in life is satisfied. It is not. There is the mystery of things withheld, but we are wrong when we seem to hear mocking tones behind the refusal. Does not all the greatest spiritual experience tell us that things may be withheld like that, and yet the greatest things be given? When Jesus prayed in the garden that His cup of bitterness might pass the answer did not come, the cup did not pass. Would you say that He was sent empty away? Might He not have turned in bitterness of heart, as we are so often tempted to do? But we know that the hunger of His spirit was satisfied, though by another path. So every unsatisfied desire of our heart, every frustrated prayer, will receive an answer like that. The letter of the petition may be shattered and broken in seeming failure, but the spirit of the petition will be answered in surprising ways. The hungry are filled with good things.

This truth has also a message for the world's need. The impression is often given that expectations of a better order of life have failed because some of those ideal pictures were impossibly high, and that we must perforce resign ourselves to a lower level of satisfaction. Perhaps that is how most men do regard the lesson of the time. We venture to assert that it is false. The lesson of the age is that some dreams may be idle dreams, but that when the hunger for attainment becomes deep enough and widespread enough dreams turn into realities.

The Church of Christ exists as a fellowship of minds and hearts which express the hunger for the kingdom of God. The only failure we need to fear is the lowering of the ideal and the lessening of the desire. It is only that which holds the kingdom back. Men do not want purity and honesty and comradeship and peace intensely enough; that is the only reason why these things are so far away from us as they are. It is a world contented with what it calls its riches, a world content to go on in the old ways, satisfied, indifferent, blind, selfish, which seems to be sent empty away. Once the hunger is aroused and men seek and pray and strive, the new days will come with their unimagined blessings. It is a law which covers the whole of life that the things for which men hunger will be given and the things for which they do not hunger must be withheld.[1]

Eighteenth Sunday after Trinity.

The Fearlessness of the Active Heart.

'This man receiveth sinners, and eateth with them.'—Lk 15².

The effect of suggestion is so great that we probably never read this story, or hear it read, without what seems to ourselves a very genuine feeling of indignation against the Pharisaic attitude. If we thought for a moment, we should recognize that the attitude which we condemn so summarily in the case of the Pharisees we most heartily approve and endorse in all the ordinary relations of life. Every influential motive of right conduct, every motive inspired by common sense, by the wisdom of ordinary experience, supports and confirms that approval. If we have for ourselves adopted a certain attitude towards life, if we face life with a definite certainty as to what in it is worthy to be sought and what must be sternly and at all risks avoided, then we shall certainly draw into closest association with those who share our attitude. And just as we instinctively seek to confirm our own attitude by this closeness of alliance with those who share it, so we shrink from the danger of making any terms with its enemies, even of seeming to countenance their enmity by meeting it with indifference or neutrality. If we compromise on an association which will relegate to the background the things that are most important for us and that we believe to be most important for all, then we are doubly betraying our trust. We are not only endangering our own faithfulness to it, but are taking the surest way to belittle its importance for those who have not yet accepted it as their own.

It is for some such reasons as these that men form themselves into exclusive groups on the basis of their deepest convictions. And so the probability is that, if we came upon this indignant protest of the Pharisees in any other connexion, we should, instead of condemning, endorse and applaud it. Yet we venture to state the case of the Pharisee, a perfectly sound case within limits, only to reject it as ultimately unsatisfying even for our ordinary human conduct.

And, first of all, is it only as a result of suggestions created by traditional respect for the Gospels, and especially for our Lord's attitude and actions, that we are ready to condemn so unhesitatingly the exclusive spirit of the Pharisees? Is there not, on the contrary, something in us which condemns not only the attitude of the Pharisee, but the same attitude in ourselves? Is there not something which whispers that the way of a cautious prudence is a denial of all that is best in our humanity, that it is attended by spiritual barrenness both for ourselves and for others, that the surest way of safety for ourselves is in facing the risks of a high enterprise, and that the only effective instrument of influence upon others is a sympathy which transcends, and in transcending may help to annihilate, the most radical differences of opinion and attitude which separate men? Are we not forced into shame of a goodness which thinks only of keeping its own robe unsullied, which shrinks from the miry ways of the common world of service?

To questions like these the heart has but one answer. It recognizes in Him, who fears no taint from closest human neighbourhood with the most erring soul, the Divine leader of men. It learns from Him to find the hopeful warmth in every heart of man, which can be cherished into a pure and purifying flame of enthusiasm for right. It learns from Him to fear only the cold heart which is frozen into helplessness through its own icy virtues, and so freezes every other heart it accidentally touches. The heart that really cares for goodness must inevitably care more for its extension than its possession.

This is the kind of goodness which appeals to us in men. And it is the peculiar glory of contemporary religion that no other seems to us genuine, that no other has any kind of appeal to us. We cannot believe in the goodness which prudently withdraws within its own borders, which is afraid of the risks of active service in a hostile or indifferent world. We are sensible enough to expect strength to prove itself in rescuing weakness, or in spending itself ceaselessly and ungrudgingly in the attempt. Religion has been too often the solitary quest of the fold for ourselves, and the solitary enjoyment of it when we thought we had found it. We have begun to learn that we are never so surely in the fold of God as when we are carrying His redeeming love into all the waste places of life and wrapping in its warmth the desolate souls who dwell there.

---

[1] S. M. Berry, *Revealing Light*, 180.

Yet it is true that this is a great venture. The bravest will recoil from a task beset by many and great dangers. The sincerest will question its possession of a power whose sources are an absolute purity of motive and love of right. Who of us is equal to these things? We know all the dangers which lurk in that kinship with our brethren which draws us to them, and through which alone we can hope to serve them. We know all the subtle sympathetic action of soul upon soul, how the weakness of one may infect what another had considered its strength, how the close contact of certain types of character will often release forces which confuse in both the sense of duty and make of each the supreme danger of the other.

We know these things and, knowing them, realize how strong the soul must be that would follow this high call of God. Yet we do not doubt that it is His call, nay that it is the one call which we can recognize in our day as indubitably His. And if it is, ought we not to consider well what is likely to help us in being faithful to it? Now that is just what the religious society can do for us—this is indeed the real function and the pre-eminent value of a church to-day. We want behind us in every venture of the soul a tradition of right which is greater than all that man has ever yet accomplished, and yet has inspired all his various imperfect accomplishment hitherto. We want a tradition which will represent not merely all that the best souls of men have yet attained, but also, however vaguely, all that the common soul of humanity has ever dreamed of attaining. We want to have our individual consciences rooted in a general conscience which will both rebuke and inspire them.

But we may say, perhaps, 'Where is the religious society that is equal to such a claim upon it? Have not the actual churches of history been refuges for the spiritually cowardly? Have they not been close corporations of the saved hardening themselves in selfishness against a humanity which they dared to declare rejected of God? Has not the taint of the Pharisee been in their blood, in their very constitution? Well, superficially, there is truth in the indictment. And yet if they had never been in fact what they might be and must become, there would indeed be little substance in our hopes for them. But underneath all their own misconception and perversion of their mission, they have always been in fact something more and greater than they knew. They have always witnessed to the love of humanity and inspired it. It is the enthusiasm of a genuine love for man, of a profound faith in man as capable of the best, that has been the fundamental and permanent note of every religious society. And it is the only note by which we shall assess the worth of any Church in the future—the note of Divine fruitfulness. There is the Spirit of God, and only there, where the spirit of man is enlarged to believe in, and to labour to evoke, the Divine possibilities in the worst.[1]

[1] A. L. Lilley, *The Religion of Life*, 107.

The Parable of the Sheep and the Goats (Mt. xxv. 31–46).

By the Reverend A. T. Cadoux, B.A., D.D., Glasgow.

Despite its wonderful beauty and power, this Parable contains elements that are very hard to understand. In the first place, the principle of judgment differs from other utterances of Jesus. Here men are not judged for their conscious relation to Him, but for their kindness or callousness to the needy. How are we to reconcile this with such a saying as, 'Whosoever shall be ashamed of me and of my words in this adulterous and sinful generation, of him shall the Son of man be ashamed, when he cometh in the glory of his Father with the holy angels' (Mk 8^{38}, Mt 16^{27}, Lk 9^{26}, and also Mt $10^{32.\ 33}$, Lk $12^{8.\ 9}$)? How, too, could the many whose hospitality Jesus had enjoyed, who had 'ministered to him of their substance,' ask, 'When saw we thee an hungred, and fed thee?' ?'

Another difficulty lies in the term, 'my brethren.' Who are they? If they are just the needy in the assembled nations, then we have to conclude either that some of 'my brethren' are amongst 'ye cursed,' or that need and goodness are essentially concomitant. And 'Ye did it unto one of these my brethren' implies a distinction between 'ye' and 'my brethren,' a distinction which is made explicit by the fact that the merciful are not called 'my brethren' but only 'blessed of my Father.' We are therefore compelled to recognize that, as it stands, the Parable tells only of the judgment of those who are not the brethren of the judge, and who are judged by their conduct towards the needy amongst his brethren. And here again difficulties arise. Why should this critical factor, 'my brethren,' be so surreptitiously introduced? And are not all men the brethren of the Son of man? Or if not, who are his brethren?

To the last question there are two possible answers. Mk $3^{34.\ 35}$ (especially in view of Mk 9^{41}, Mt 10^{42}) suggests that 'my brethren' might mean the followers of Jesus. But if so, then should not the merciful, since they did the will of God, be included amongst His brethren? And the discrepancy with Mk 8^{38} still remains.

The other possibility is to take it that by 'my brethren' the Son of man means 'my fellow-Jews.' In this case we can take τὰ ἔθνη in the usual New Testament significance of 'the Gentiles,' and the Parable becomes one in which the Gentiles are judged by the way in which they have treated the Jews. But this destroys its broad humanity and makes it contribute to a narrow nationalism quite foreign to the mind of Jesus, though possible to the Judaizing section of the early Church.

But both these interpretations of 'my brethren' involve another difficulty. For the people of all nations are judged by their conduct towards 'my brethren,' whereas by no means every soul born into the world has had the chance of helping a needy Jew or Christian.

Now no one setting out to depict the judgment of 'all the nations' would be likely to propound as a criterion of their destiny a test that would be applicable to only a fraction of them. Especially would this be unlikely to an imagination capable of creating such a parable. But an inadequacy of this sort might easily arise inadvertently as the result of editorial changes, which might also account for Judaistic colouring.

It is to be noted in this connexion that the judge throughout the body of the Parable is 'the king,' and only in the introductory sentence is he called 'the Son of man.' This change in itself calls for explanation, especially as the passage is not properly speaking a parable at all. In His only other analogous use of the word 'king' Jesus means 'God,' *i.e.* in 'the city of the great king' (Mt 5^{35}); and the dominant phrase of His teaching 'the kingdom of God' confirms this meaning.

It may be therefore that in the original form of this passage Jesus depicted the judgment of the nations by God, but that the Evangelist understood 'the king' to be not God but Jesus, and made his interpretation clear by replacing the original opening by v.^{31}, 'But when the Son of man shall come in his glory, and all the angels with him, then shall he sit on the throne of his glory.'

In support of this suggestion it may be remarked that the First Evangelist lays great stress upon the judgeship of Jesus, and where we can check his procedure he is found in more than one case modifying his source in this interest. For instance, the Marcan version of the Gerasene madman's cry, 'I adjure thee by God, torment me not,' appears in Matthew as, 'Art thou come hither to torment us *before the time*?' Very significant is the form in which the above-cited Mk 8^{38} is given in Mt 16^{27}, 'For the Son of man shall come in the glory of his Father with his angels; and then shall he render unto every man according to his deeds.' Not only does the alteration involve the express assertion that the Son of man will be judge, but the criterion of judgment is so modified as to remove the contradiction between the Marcan saying and the Parable of the Sheep and Goats. The extent of the Matthæan departure here from the original form of the saying may be judged by the fact that in Q's version of it as given by Luke ($12^{8.\ 9}$) the Son of man is witness rather than judge, as is Jesus in that given by Mt $10^{32.\ 33}$, but the latter is so turned as to seem to speak rather of Jesus' prayer than of His appearance at the last judgment, 'Every one therefore who shall confess me before men, him will I also confess before my Father which is in heaven . . .' A further instance for consideration is that in place of the Lucan, 'He (*i.e.* the master of the house) shall answer and say to you, I know not whence ye are' (13^{25}), we have in Mt 7^{23}, 'Then will I profess unto them, I never knew you.'

On the other hand, when we consider such sayings as, 'Whosoever shall receive one such little child in my name, receiveth me; and whosoever receiveth me, receiveth not me, but him that sent me (Mk 9^{37}), and, 'He that receiveth you receiveth me, and he that receiveth me receiveth him that sent me' (Mt 10^{40}; cf. Lk 10^{16}), they suggest to us that in describing the final quality of life, Jesus would think of God rather than of Himself as saying, 'Inasmuch as ye did it not unto one of these least, ye did it not unto me.'

And now we may note that, if we compare Mt 19^{28} with Lk $22^{28.\,29}$, the Matthæan version has an additional phrase very like that which seems to have been added at the beginning of our Parable. It runs, 'in the regeneration (παλιγγενεσία), when the Son of man shall sit on the throne of his glory.' And in this case the editorial nature of the addition is confirmed by the statement of Dalman (*Words of Jesus*, p. 177) that παλιγγενεσία cannot be literally translated into Hebrew or Aramaic.

It is difficult, therefore, to avoid the conclusion that in both these cases (Mt 25^{31} 19^{28}) we should see the influence of the Similitudes of Enoch, where 'on the throne of his glory' is a commonplace, and where—in ch. 62—the Son of man is twice said to 'sit on the throne of his glory.' Nor does this seem to be the only influence of Enoch on the existing form of the Parable. 'The eternal fire prepared for the devil and his angels' (Mt 25^{41}) is strange amongst the words of Jesus as a synonym for the usual 'Gehenna,' and He speaks always of 'demons,' not of the devil's 'angels.' But Enoch has much to say of evil angels, and we are especially reminded of his vision (ch. 54) of 'a deep valley with burning fire' where were cast 'the kings and the mighty,' and where he saw chains which he was told were 'prepared for the hosts of Azazel' (*i.e.* for the evil angels).

Of course, if in the original form of the Parable God was 'the king,' then several more elements in the existing form must be reckoned as editorial. The king as God could not have been said to say, 'Come, ye blessed *of my Father*,' and it will be noted that the parallel phrase in v.^{41}, 'Depart from me, ye cursed,' is without 'of my Father.' Even in the Parable as it stands these words are awkward, for 'Ye blessed of my Father' is a term more appropriate from a king's son than from a king.

And if God is the judge, then the words 'my brethren' of v.^{40} must be editorial, if indeed they belonged to the original text at all, which their absence from B and certain other authorities makes doubtful. They are also absent from the parallel phrase of v.^{45}: 'Inasmuch as ye did it not unto one of the least of these.' And their removal from v.^{40}, removes the confusion which they create. Without them the criterion is restored to its simple and broad humanity. The nations are judged, not by their behaviour to Jews or Christians, but by their pity or lack of it to any needy soul in their midst.

But though we seem justified in concluding that in the original form of the Parable God was the judge, and in making the concomitant deduction of editorial additions (to which we should possibly add v.^{46}), two questions still remain. Was the Parable originally a parable of the judgment of all nations or only of the Gentiles? And why is the criterion of judgment different from that of Mk 8^{38} or Lk 13^{24-27}, *i.e.* why has it no reference to a man's attitude to Jesus? These two questions are closely connected; for while on the one hand τὰ ἔθνη (Mt 25^{32}) usually in the New Testament has the meaning of 'the Gentiles,' on the other hand Mk 8^{38} and Lk 13^{24-27} are couched in terms that seem to have Jews only in view, for the former speaks of those who are in the midst of 'this sinful and adulterous generation,' and the latter of those who thought they had privileged acquaintance with 'the master of the house.'

Yet the distinction can hardly be merely national, *i.e.*, as between Jew and Gentile. For in the Parable of Dives and Lazarus the rich Jew is judged on precisely the criterion employed in dividing the sheep from the goats. And if, in the latter Parable, we have an adequate account of the judgment of the Gentile as distinct from the Jew, it would imply that no Gentile was to have the privilege of the gospel. The difference seems therefore to imply a difference of opportunity, the coincidence of the privileged with the Jew merely reflecting the actual situation when Jesus spoke. We must, therefore, take πάντα τὰ ἔθνη in its most inclusive sense—all 'the nations,' which means that, so far as the privileged are concerned, this is only one aspect of the judgment they must undergo: those who know must pass an additional test, from which the ignorant are free. And this difference brings the suggestion that in the Parable of the Shut Door, as told in Lk 13^{24-27}, and in the Parable of the Sheep and the Goats, we have complementary pictures of judgment. Both Parables are of the same peculiar nature—half-parables—the figures and what they depict being mingled. It is significant also that in Mt $25^{11.\,12}$ (the difficult ending of the Parable of the Virgins) we have what appears in more appropriate setting at the end of the Lucan Parable of the Shut Door (Lk 13^{25b}), and that between these verses and the Parable of the Sheep and the Goats comes only another Parable which, according to Luke (19^{11}), belongs to a different occasion. These two semi-parables, moreover, are complementary in their contents. In the one those who are judged claim acquaintance with the judge, 'We did eat and drink in thy presence . . .,' and the judge repudiates the claim, 'I tell you, I know not whence ye are.' In the other the judge claims acquaintance with the judged, and is answered with astonishment, 'When saw we thee . . .?' The first Parable was, Luke tells us, spoken in answer to a Jew who asked, 'Lord, are they few that be saved?' It is the question of one who thinks himself of their number and wants to know how exclusive the privilege is. Jesus' answer is that consciousness of privilege is only too likely to blind a man to the necessity of utmost concentration of endeavour, if he is not to miss that for which the privilege has been given. Privilege will be pleaded in vain by those who have not agonized to enter at the narrow door.

But if this was all that Jesus said, it would leave the portrayal of judgment incomplete. To say nothing of the unprivileged would leave something unsaid that concerned all. The Parable of the Sheep and the Goats is the complement of that of the Narrow Door. Here, in God's final judgment upon human life, we have again one of the most frequently reiterated truths of Jesus' teaching—that what we endeavour to be to our fellows determines what God will be to us.

The two Parables give two essential aspects of judgment upon life. For him who has heard the Divine invitation and knows that it is life's opportunity, there is the test of focused endeavour—the narrow door. For all men there is the test of compassion: are you open to those calls that show life to be larger than your private pains and pleasures? The qualities tested seem to be opposite, yet both are needed. The motions of compassion are the beginning of spiritual discernment: the spontaneity of charity keeps concentration wholesome; and the consummation of knowledge and duty is in love.

If these two Parables stood beside each other in Q, it is likely enough that Luke, not finding in the Parable of the judgment of all the nations any reference to the gospel, omitted it, replacing it by a saying that told how 'they shall come from the east and the west, and from the north and the south, and shall sit down in the kingdom of God,' but gave no criterion of admission (Lk $13^{28.\,29}$; cf. Mt $8^{11.\,12}$).

Recent Foreign Theology.

Missionary Literature.

FROM the publishing house of C. Bertelsmann, in Gütersloh, three works dealing with missionary themes have recently been issued:

The Letters of the Apostle Paul considered as Missionary Epistles,[1] by Dr. Julius Richter. The key to the understanding of Paul the theologian and the ecclesiastical statesman, is found in the manifold demands made upon him as a missionary. Since the Edinburgh Conference, undue stress has been laid, it is thought, upon the missionary strategy of Paul, for it was frequently impossible for him to carry out his plans. All that the scanty material warrants us in saying is that he had very little time for organizing Churches. His missionary journeys are 'comparable to the widespread evangelistic tours of Bishop William Taylor, Dr. John Mott, and Dr. Sherwood Eddy rather than to the steady and persevering labour of present-day missionaries.'

In studying Paul's attitude towards the heathen world it is essential to distinguish between (*a*) the superstitious beliefs of the common people encountered in Lystra, Philippi, and Ephesus; (*b*) the philosophical theories of the Athenians, with their pantheistic watchwords; and (*c*) the syncretism which resulted from the impact of Oriental cults upon Hellenistic religions. As different as the forms of error were the Apostle's modes of presenting the gospel message. He was neither an orthodox Lutheran nor a modern Rationalist, but 'a typical Oriental, elaborating his thoughts now in one direction, now in another, to meet changing needs.' Traces of humour are discovered in Paul's use of the phraseology of the Mystery religions, as, *e.g.*, Ph 4^{12}, 2 Co 3^{18}. 'It is obvious that this continually changing necessity of combating and overcoming erroneous and dangerous tendencies could not fail to stimulate the Apostle's theological thought.'

---

[1] *Die Briefe des Apostels Paulus als missionarische Sendschreiben*, von Professor D. Julius Richter (pp. 212; geb. M.8).

Four introductory studies on 'The Personality of Paul,' 'Paul as Missionary,' 'The Message,' and 'Paul's Missionary Methods,' are followed by separate and detailed studies of the thirteen Epistles. It is acknowledged that the occasion of the Epistle to the Philippians was personal, that it was written primarily to express thanks for a gift. Nevertheless, 'from beginning to end it is a missionary Epistle,' for reference is made in it to many questions upon which the Church needed the guidance which is authoritatively given. The Epistle is 'more than and different from a private letter; it gives wise ecclesiastical guidance in a letter of courteous thanks.'

Dr. Richter's main contention is that full consideration should be given to the manifold demands made upon Paul in the course of his missionary labours before assuming that he assimilated foreign elements from Greek or Oriental religions. He pleads for a reversal of the customary procedure, and would begin, not with Paul the theologian, but with Paul the missionary. 'The message is primary, the theology is secondary.' Though the alternatives presented are not mutually exclusive, Dr. Richter shows that it is instructive to supplement the use of Paul's Epistles 'as quarries for fragments of Pauline theology,' by studying them 'as missionary Epistles, in which Paul endeavours to guide the Churches in their internal and external storms.'

Secularism and Missions,[1] by Dr. Siegfried Knak, amplifies and applies to the Christian conscience the declaration of the Jerusalem Conference that the most formidable opposition to the gospel may be summarized in 'Secularism' or 'Secular Civilization.' From the writings of Dr. Rufus Jones and Judge Lindsey quotations are made to show that similar conditions obtain in the religious life of Germany. Of special value is the blending of appreciation of the Youth movement, with plain indications of its perils. Christians are warned against the optimism which is the result of underestimating the danger of secularism. Athanasius said of Julian's attempt to secularize Christianity: *nubicula est, prœterebit*, but 'whereas Julian had the spirit of the age against him, the secularism of to-day has the spirit of the age on its side.' Christians are impressively exhorted not to substitute secular culture for religious evangelism and education in their missionary work. Above all, the lesson of the present crisis must be learnt: 'setting aside secondary matters, let us concentrate on essentials in order that what is small may become smaller and what is great may be seen in its true greatness.'

Der Gott des Wortes und die Mission, by Dr. Erich Schaeder (M.1.20), is an address delivered at a Conference on Missions in February 1929. The speaker's purpose was to expound the significance of the Jerusalem Conference, and approval is expressed of its attitude towards non-Christian religions. Dr. Schaeder agrees that nowadays no theologian thinks that non-Christian peoples are left without any revelation in the unrelieved darkness of error. His criticism is that truths, rightly appreciated, are left in isolation instead of being placed in their context. It would, *e.g.*, then have been clearly seen that the conception of the majesty of God in Islam differs greatly from that of Paul and Luther. Again, when Hinduism speaks of the Ultimate Reality and interprets it as spiritual, it must not be forgotten that there is a profound difference between the absolute spirit of human speculation and the Divine Spirit revealed in the Bible.

Dr. Schaeder recognizes that the aim of the Jerusalem message is to assert and to establish the absolute claims of Christianity, but in such statements as that 'Christ is the crown of Hinduism' he detects a tendency to form a syncretistic religion in which Christianity will have its allotted place alongside other religions. In his judgment what is urgently needed in the present theological situation is insistence on 'the immanence of the transcendent God . . . present and active even where He is not known, and where He is sought but not found.' True to his theocentric position, Dr. Schaeder contends that the missionary motive in preaching the Word of God is to bring non-Christians into a personal relation to God which is absolutely new, as compared with their previous religious experience.

J. G. Tasker.

Leamington Spa.

St. Paul's Use of the Old Testament.

Paul and his Bible,[2] by Herr O. Michel, is volume 18 of the series of 'Scientific Monographs,' edited by Dr. Schlatter of Tübingen and Dr. Lütgert of

---

[1] *Säkularismus und Mission*, von Missionsdirektor D. Siegfried Knak (pp. 41; M.1.20).

[2] *Paulus und seine Bibel*, von O. Michel, xii, S. 212 (Bertelsmann, Gütersloh; geb. M.9).

Halle. The 'Introduction' summarizes with ability and discrimination the results of scholarly research from Cappellus (1650) to the present day. The respective themes of four chapters, with many sub-divisions, are:

1. 'What does Paul understand by Holy Scripture?' Michel agrees with Vollmer that the Apostle's quotations are from different recensions of the LXX, and with Kautzsch that there is no evidence of preference for the Massoretic Text. 'He could read his Bible in the original Hebrew, but he lived and worked with the Greek version.' In a detailed examination of Paul's quotations the introductory formulæ are distinguished, and the question of amalgamation of passages is discussed. This section includes a criticism of hypotheses that haggadistic and apocalyptic traditions, or primitive *Florilegia*, were amongst the Apostle's sources. Dr. Rendel Harris (*Testimonies*) is held to be right in attaching more importance to anti-Jewish Christian anthologies than to Jewish or Jewish-Hellenistic collections. The work of Professor Burkitt and of Dr. Harris is regarded as of great value for the critical study of the citations in Matthew, but, in Michel's opinion, they underestimate the difficulties of their hypothesis.

2. 'How is Paul's interpretation of Scripture related to the interpretation of his contemporaries, as, *e.g.*, the Rabbis and Philo?' (*a*) The peculiarities of Rabbinic exegesis are described, and the texts of the Rabbis and of Paul are compared. Whilst Paul's arguments often follow the methods of the Rabbis, yet he differs from them. The Rabbis read into the text what will glorify Israel, but Paul reads into it his dogmatic, historical, and ethical convictions. 'These, however, are not simply the traditions, manners, and customs of his time, but rather attempts to understand life and history from his new knowledge of the gospel and independent of race and nationality. The Rabbi reveals, in his use of Scripture, his learning; Paul his prophetic mission.' (*b*) After an examination of the arguments of Vollmer, Surenhus, and Siegfried, Michel adjudges that it is improbable that Paul knew the writings of Philo, and yet there are many links between them. 'We must conclude that Paul and Philo are dependent on common traditions and exegetical methods, disseminated in the synagogue addresses on the Sabbath day. . . . The pre-Philonic and the pre-Pauline traditions and methods will yet solve the problems which are at present unexplained.'

3. 'What significance has the Old Testament for Paul?' In this section many appreciative references are made to Harnack's recent work,[1] in which the theory is advanced that, in addition to the communities that were distinctly Pauline, there were in Palestine and in the Diaspora communities that not only placed the Old Testament on a level with the gospel, but also gave it the pre-eminence. Michel agrees that in the early Christian centuries the Old Testament was differently regarded in different communities, but he finds no reason for speaking of two kinds of primitive Christian Churches. Only gradually did the Old Testament win its way to general esteem, but the absence of quotations from it in Paul's shorter Epistles does not warrant the conclusion that he wished to discourage Christians from reading it. 'The Apostle could not assume that Old Testament rolls were in possession of a small Christian community, therefore he does not expressly advise that it be regularly read. . . . In the Pauline writings there is not a single warning to read the Old Testament with caution, nor any preference expressed for other edifying literature.' Michel further holds that the antithesis πνεῦμα–γράμμα is wrongly used to emphasize the opposition between 'book religion' 'and the religion of the spirit.' In the Old Testament, as in the New Testament, 'the religion of the word' may refer either to the oral or to the written word; it becomes 'book religion' only when it is forgotten that the word is living and spirit-breathed, for 'the religion of the word is the religion of the spirit.'

4. 'What light does Paul's interpretation of Scripture cast upon the history of primitive Christianity?' A careful study of Paul's missionary addresses shows that, notwithstanding critical difficulties, the Old Testament was effectively used. 'It was not the Scriptural quotations which gave offence to the unbelieving Jews, though sometimes the Apostle's methods were not approved; but to the believing Jews his appeals were weighty. . . . Evidence is also not lacking that, in his missionary preaching to the Gentiles, Paul made restricted references to the Old Testament' (cf. Ac 13^{47}). The attitude of Paul to the Old Testament is instructively compared with the attitude of Jesus: 'When Jesus applied Old Testament passages to Himself He prepared the way for the Christological interpretation which was characteristic of Paul.' In conclusion, the influence of Paul on the later writers of the New Testament and on the Apostolic Fathers is traced in detail. He used the methods of his time, and those methods are antiquated, but

---

[1] *Das A.T. in den paulinischen Briefen und in den paulinischen Gemeinden.* Sitzungsberichte der preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaft. 1928.

that does not lessen for the Christian expositor the permanent value of his contribution to the understanding and interpretation of the Old Testament.

J. G. Tasker.

Leamington Spa.

The Prophet Jeremiah.[1]

We have nothing exactly like this kind of monograph in English. Professor Volz's essay, in fifty-five pages, gives a concise, fascinating account of the prophet and his writings, which serves to introduce the reader to the canonical Book of Jeremiah, and also—which is no small service—to suggest at least eight or nine fresh sermons to any preacher who has a mind at all. The late Dr. A. B. Davidson could do this, and did it in some of his lectures on the minor prophets. But the art of it has left us. The English student, of course, has a small book like Professor Cheyne's in the 'Men of the Bible' series, one of the best things he ever did in this department. But Cheyne's book is larger and more detailed than Professor Volz's, and the latter is up to date in his criticism. Scholars know his commentary and his textual studies on Jeremiah. The present essay was first published in 1918, and this is the third edition. Its popularity is partly due to the fact that in the present state of the German people the message of Jeremiah seems to have a specially apt illustration. But Professor Volz's handling would be enough to carry the booklet far and wide. One has read recent large books on Jeremiah in English and German, but the present reviewer is bound to confess that he could not stop reading this study till he had finished it at a sitting, and that it made him desire to write some new sermons on the prophet. For example, 'They have healed the hurt of my people slightly, saying, Peace, Peace, when there is no peace.' The first twelve pages of Volz's study light up this saying, so that the contemporary tendency of some patriots in China and India to make national independence their aim instead of religion and inward moral reform becomes a remarkable instance of what Volz brings out in dealing with the historical situation of Jerusalem in Jeremiah's day.

God and Man.[2]

Professor Brunner, as those who have heard him know, is one of the most persuasive members of the Barthian School. Lecturing, for him, is a mission in the best sense of the term; his arguments are charged with a sense of responsibility and a verve that render them singularly attractive. In writing, these qualities are also felt. The present monograph contains four recent addresses, 'Vier Untersuchungen über das personhafte Sein.' The first, on the 'Philosophic Idea of God and the Creator-God of Faith,' stresses the well-known idea of the school that the God of faith is the giving and forgiving God of love, from whose action all our religious life arises, so that faith may be called the speech of the Holy Spirit in and to us. This Lord is the Creator of all in our life, and thus is not to be identified with any deity of a philosophical system or with some God who is realized in the mystical consciousness. Against idealism or realism or any form of pantheism Brunner sets up the Christian conception of an objective God, whose gracious action determines human faith and thought. The second lecture, on 'The Belief in Justification and the Problem of Ethics,' culminates in agreement with Kant that the good man does good deeds, not that good deeds make a good personality. This is the kernel of faith in justification. 'If God's position towards us depends on our activity, then there is no hope for us,' says Brunner sharply, and in saying so he claims to be reproducing the essence of the Pauline and the Reformed faith, which makes the good man the creation of God in Christ. The third essay, on 'The Church and Revelation,' is particularly timely. It is a strong protest against both the mechanical, clerical notion of the Church, and also the fanatical individualism which fails to see in the Church anything more than a self-created group of like-minded pietists. The latter danger Brunner appears to fear even more than the former, perhaps because it is so plausible. The fourth address, on 'Biblical Psychology,' brings out the divergence of Christian psychology from empirical psychology. 'The latter recognizes indeed as well as the Christian does, that there are contradictions in every man, but because these contradictions are accidental and not essential, it believes it is justified in ignoring them.' Where the Christian as opposed to the theoretical psychologist begins, is by recognizing this clash as due to sin. Man is made in the likeness of God, and this same man is sinful, that is, a disobedient creature; here we have, says Brunner, what differentiates the Christian knowledge of the human ego from any theoretical or empirical psychology.

---

[1] Paul Volz, *Der Prophet Jeremia*, Dritte, durchgesehene Auflage (J. C. B. Mohr, Tübingen, 1930).

[2] *Gott und Mensch*, by Emil Brunner (J. C. B. Mohr, Tübingen; M.3.60).

The order of thought might have led to the third essay being put last. There are some repetitions, as is only natural, since the four addresses cover the same ground and repeat sometimes the same axioms. But the drive of the lectures is undeniable. Probably some who find Barth himself rather difficult to follow would be helped to a better understanding of the school if they began by reading a small book like this, which is popular without being thin, and logical without being arid. Brunner could not be arid if he tried. And he is logical in the sense of having a reasoned position, from which he deduces conclusions about theology and religion.

James Moffatt.

New York.

Contributions and Comments.

Paul's Sense of Beauty.

It is often said that Paul, the Apostle, though he was such a great traveller, never remarks in his writings on the lovely scenery he must have seen, and even his reference to a beautiful tree in Ro 11[17-24] is pointed to as an unnatural way, characteristic of the man who cared not for natural beauty. I had often seen those disparaging remarks in print, and the other day I heard them in a sermon.

Now I think something can be said on the other side. As a Jew, how he must have loved the Psalms, which are full of the love of Nature! How he would solace himself some sleepless night by recalling the 23rd Psalm, or the 8th, or the 18th, or the 104th! Even as a Jew he glorified God for His wonderful works, but after his illumination by Jesus Christ, the earth became a new world to him, for was it not the world created by his Saviour? 'All things were created by him, and for him; by him all things hold together' (Col. 1[16. 17]). We are told that he was blind to all the glory that was Greece on Areopagus Hill, but his eyes were full of a greater glory as he spoke of a God which made the world and all things therein, the Lord of heaven and earth, and continuing he said, 'In him we live, move, and have our being.' Afterwards, when he wrote his letter to the Romans (1[20-23]), he speaks not of the glory that was Rome, but of the invisible things of God, since the creation of the world, being perceived through the things that are made, even His everlasting power and divinity, and sighed for those who change the glory of the incorruptible into the image of corruptible things.

Yes, the world was so beautiful that God must have made it, and yet how marred by sin, for it groans and travails in pain, waiting for the redemption (Ro 8[20-22]) that will assuredly come, for, as he says in Ro 11[36], 'of him, and through him, and to him, are all things.' In 1 Co 15 we can see that the glory of the stars appealed to him.

'How beautiful God is!' said Charles Kingsley, as he lay dying. Looking out of his window to behold the landscape which he loved so well, he exclaimed upon its beauty. Surely the Apostle Paul would have joined him in these praises.

D. MacGillivray.

Shanghai.

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES 1930–1931: PRELIMINARY ANNOUNCEMENT.

The survey of the contribution made by the different countries to the varying branches of Biblical Science will be continued during the coming year. Next month a further instalment of Professor Dibelius's article will be given, and the following month Professor Vincent Taylor will summarize 'France's Contribution to New Testament Science.' The series of articles on 'Moral Problems of To-day' will also be continued. In the October number Professor John Macmurray will write on 'Self-expression.' This will probably be followed by a study by Professor Gossip on 'Reward and Punishment.' During the year there will be a number of expository articles on related subjects. A fresh series will survey the 'Great Attacks on Christianity,' beginning with Celsus and Porphyry and including those of mediæval and of modern times. Professor Moffatt will contribute an account of 'Some Letters to Women on the Christian Faith,' such as the letter of Porphyry to Marcella, Abelard to Héloïse, and Fénelon to his wife. A fuller announcement will be made next month.

Entre Nous.

A Monument in Stone.

Footprints in the Snow contains twenty-three children's addresses. In our opinion they should make a wide appeal, but in nothing perhaps does individual liking play a greater part than in sermons for boys and girls. So we have quoted one. It is slightly abridged, but it will be found quite representative, and from it readers may make up their own minds whether it suits them. The author is Mr. H. L. Hemmens, who will be remembered for his excellent short life of George Grenfell which he prepared a few years ago for the series of missionary biographies published by the Student Christian Movement. *Footprints in the Snow* is also published by the Student Christian Movement (3s. 6d. net).

'There is rising in Liverpool a great and noble cathedral. When it is finished it will be the third largest Protestant cathedral in the world. A short time ago, I was conducted over the unfinished building by one of the officials, and, in the course of the journey, he told me an interesting story about its architect.

'For many years men and women had talked and dreamed of a cathedral for the great northern city, and at the beginning of this century they made it known that they were ready to receive plans for the building from any architect who was prepared to submit them. When the plans were received, they were examined by a committee of three experts. These men spent a long time examining them, and at the end they were unanimous that one set of plans came the nearest to the ideas of the authorities, and would ensure that this House of God should be a worthy one.

'They next ascertained who the successful architect was—the plans were signed with a *nom de plume* only—and, to their surprise, they discovered that he was a young man, only twenty-one years old. At first some said, 'It is impossible to entrust so great a task as the building of this cathedral to such a youth. A more experienced man must be found.' Others said: 'No! We have given our word that the man whose plans are the best shall be awarded the prize and entrusted with the work.'

'The building of the cathedral has been going on for about twenty-five years, and it is expected that the cathedral will take another twenty years to finish. It stands on a hill and towers already above the clatter and grime of the city. Already thousands of people may worship within its walls, receive inspiration from its glorious organ, and hear God's messengers speak in it.

'The young architect must first have heard of the idea of this cathedral when he was a boy at school, and during the years he was serving his articles in an office, he was dreaming his dreams and making his first rough sketches of the building that was to be. He often worked late at night to perfect his designs, carefully thinking out each part so that together they should make a complete whole. When he was still young, his plans were accepted, and through all the long years so far, the major task that has occupied him has been the building of this temple of God. There is good reason to hope that he will live to see the completion of the task. And so he will have the satisfaction of knowing that his life has been spent in the one effort of providing a building in which people can worship, which will speak to multitudes of the best and most important things. It is all according to the plan.

'It is not the privilege of many to design a cathedral or church or other house of God. But you have long years stretching before you, and you can make of them what you will. You can resolve that they shall be spent in the service of God and for the building of His Kingdom. And He will show you how it may be done. For He has a plan for your life, and day by day you may ask Him how it may be carried out. As you do this and act upon it, you will know that your life will speak to people about Him, and you may be sure, that long after your life is finished, the record you leave behind you will go on speaking of Him.

'One other fact I learned from my guide. Liverpool Cathedral is to have its Roll of Honour, on which will be inscribed the names of all who have taken any part in its creation. Of course, the architect's name will be there, and the firms of builders, as well as the organ-builders and the men who carved the beautiful woodwork. But it will also include the men who hewed the stones from the quarry and those who mixed the mortar and, for all I know, those who carried the bricks up the ladders. Not one name will be missing.

'That reminded me of another Roll of Honour. It is called the Lamb's Book of Life. The names of all who serve God are there. It contains famous names like those of Paul and Bunyan, Carey and

Livingstone, Grenfell and Timothy Richard; but it contains hosts of names of those who are forgotten here but remembered there. There is a place for every one's name, including yours. I wonder if yours is there?'[1]

Fire Kindleth Fire.

Fire Kindleth Fire (Blackie; 6s. net) is an autobiography, for the experiences described are true and the opinions and convictions are those genuinely held by a headmistress. It differs from the ordinary autobiography because the actual name of the headmistress is not given. She appears as 'Marion Cleeve,' and the locality of the Municipal Secondary School for Girls that she was head of is concealed under the name 'Snellham.' This plan has disadvantages, but it has also advantages enabling her to write with directness of recent incidents and living persons. Marion Cleeve, though she pictures herself as a prim person, short-sighted, and lacking in presence, is a great headmistress, full of idealism, sanity, and humour.

She herself was educated in a school where there was a sort of spiritual tyranny, and she had it borne in on her that there is such a thing as reaction in the moral sphere. The ideal that she worked her way to in Snellham was that of free growth. 'I annexed it from a passage in the second book of Samuel, which runs as follows: "One (R.V.) that ruleth over men must be just, ruling in the fear of God. And he shall be as the light of the morning when the sun riseth, even a morning without clouds; as the tender grass springing out of the earth, by clear shining after rain." These words are descriptive of one of nature's beautiful transformation scenes, and there can be no finer ideal of the effect of influence. I have known characters whose influence was as "the shadow of a great rock in a weary land," and rested gratefully under such. But with the young—not rest but growth.'

On the day she was appointed a friend said to her, '"You will have to face many difficult situations, and encounter much that is hard to bear. That is inevitable in public life. Remember that, speaking generally, men appreciate right doing. You may meet with exceptions, but the generality of men admire righteousness even when they do not practise it." . . . One result of my friend's emphasis on righteousness was that the word stuck to me, and I came to admire the virtue it connotes as strong and practical—one which allows of no hedging and is free from sentimentality. This ideal I passed on to my girls. (Is it possible for a head to have any sort of ideal and not pass it on to her school?) For more than twenty-five years, I never opened school without reading the Collect for Daily Grace, and, as I prayed "that all our doings may be ordered by Thy governance, to do always that is righteous in Thy sight," I felt I was asking the best and safest for the young people whose bowed heads were before me.

'The same friend went further with his kindly advice. "If ever you are hesitating," he said, "between two courses of action, the one being more merciful than just, the other more just than merciful, decide on the former. Your mistake, if you make one, will then be on the right side." This counsel served me in good stead hundreds of times.'

The scope of this excellent autobiography can be gathered from the titles of the chapters: 'Snellham: The Scene of my Life Work'; 'Methods and Principles of Management'; 'Discipline'; 'The Curriculum: Religious Instruction'; 'The General Curriculum'; 'My Experience of the Municipal Control of Education.' Her chapter on Religious Instruction bears the closest reading. Here are some of the points which she touches on. The aim in religious instruction is to lay a foundation for future study and teaching. Religious instruction extends beyond the 'Scripture period' for 'all subjects have a theistic background when taught by those who believe—believe *à fond*—in God.' The most important result of Scripture teaching is the apprehension of the spiritual. The difficulties in the way of spiritual teaching are considered and the necessity of eliminating non-essentials from the syllabus. Her own ideal was of orderly knowledge of the Bible content, not neglecting its literary quality. In class she and the girls read in turn. Open Bibles were always allowed in question time. Her outline of a one-period weekly course extending over six years is given, and she shows how she gradually introduced such ideas as the following: Anthropomorphism, Progressive Morality, the 'Fosdick idea,' the Jewish Advance in Conceptions of God, Legend. The last point which she deals with is 'My Indebtedness to Sunday Schools.'

---

[1] H. L. Hemmens, *Footprints in the Snow*, 36.

Printed by **Morrison & Gibb Limited**, Tanfield Works,
and Published by **T. & T. Clark**, 38 George Street,
Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to **The Editor**, Kings
Gate, Aberdeen, Scotland.

1- 4.50

v.41

DEMCO
FOR REFERENCE
Do Not Take From This Room

UNITED THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY